

Finite-size corrections to Fermi's Golden rule

II: Quasi-stationary composite states

Kenzo Ishikawa⁽¹⁾ and Yutaka Tobita⁽²⁾

(1)Department of Physics, Faculty of Science,

Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-0810, Japan and

(2)Department of Mathematics and Physics,

Faculty of Science, Hirosaki University, Hirosaki , Japan

(Dated: July 29, 2016)

Abstract

Many-body states described by a Schrödinger equation include states of overlapping waves of non-vanishing interaction energies. These peculiar states formed in many-body transitions remain in asymptotic regions, and lead a new component to the transition probability. The probability is computed rigorously following the von Neumann's fundamental principle of quantum mechanics with an S-matrix that is defined with normalized functions, instead of plane waves. That includes the intriguing correction term to the Fermi's golden rule, in which a visible energy is smaller than the initial energy, and reveals macroscopic quantum phenomena for light particles. Processes in Quantum Electrodynamics are analyzed and the sizable corrections are found in the dilute systems. The results suggest that these states play important roles in natural phenomena, and the verification in laboratory would be possible with recent advanced technology.

I. FINITE-SIZE CORRECTIONS TO FERMI'S GOLDEN RULE

Transition probability is a fundamental physical quantity and determines measured values in experiments and the evolution of physical states in nature. That is governed by an asymptotic behavior of the solution of the Schrödinger equation. For particle-like states of small sizes, their interaction turns off rapidly, and the transition amplitude is computed under an adiabatic switch off of the interaction. For wave-like states of large sizes, however, the interaction does not switch off for the overlapping waves, and the transition shows different behaviors. This paper studies the wave functions and the transition probabilities in the extreme forward direction that reveal the unique properties of the overlapping waves.

The transition probability from a state $|i\rangle$ to another $|f\rangle$ is given by $P = |\langle f|i\rangle|^2$, for normalized states from the von Neumann's fundamental principle of the quantum mechanics (FQM). In previous works, the present authors studied the transitions of the overlapping waves based on FQM [1–3]. Wave fields express these systems, and the Hamiltonian is composed of a free part H_0 and an interaction part H_{int} . H_0 is a bi-linear form of the fields and H_{int} is a higher power form. Eigenvalue of H_0 determines the frequency of the wave, and is called a wave kinetic-energy. An energy value of $\langle H_{int} \rangle$ is the wave interaction-energy or the potential energy, and is not related with the frequency. This is similar to a potential energy of classical mechanics.

In a scattering of point particles interacting with a short range potential, the transition probability satisfies the conservation law of the kinetic energy. The sum of each energy $E(\vec{p}) = \sqrt{c^2\vec{p}^2 + m^2c^4}$, where c , $\vec{p}$, and m is the speed of light, momentum, and mass agrees with the total energy. Now, the wave function for overlapping large waves has a component that satisfies the conservation law of the kinetic energy, and the other component that does not. The second one inherent in relativistic systems is a quasi-stationary composite state (QCS). QCS has a wave interaction-energy, and a kinetic-energy that deviates from the total energy and has a continuous spectrum. Accordingly, the transition to final states of a kinetic-energy E_f different from that of the initial state E_i occurs, and the probability from a state $|i\rangle$ to a state $|f\rangle$ defined according to FQM becomes

$$P = \Gamma T + P^{(d)}, \quad (1)$$

at a finite time-interval T for $P \ll 1$. Γ is derived from a short distance correlation, smooth in angle toward the forward direction, and computed by the Fermi's golden rule [4–6]. Γ

is a function of the parameters in the Lagrangian and the de Broglie wave length of the momenta of the initial or final waves expressed by the Planck constant $\hbar$, $\frac{\hbar}{p}$, where $\hbar = \frac{h}{2\pi}$. $P^{(d)}$ has different dependences on the physical parameters from Γ and its effects are clearly separated. That has a typical length $\frac{\hbar E}{m^2 c^3}$, and the magnitude proportional to a spatial size covered by the wave function, σ . $P^{(d)}$ has the origin in QCS, which is singular in the forward direction, and is computed as a correction to Fermi's golden rule.

The probability of the processes which depends on the time interval T is rigorously computed, according to FQM, by an S-matrix $S[T]$ defined with the normalized states, wave packets, of satisfying the realistic conditions [1–3]. Actually, waves in nature are not exact plane waves but have finite ranges in space and are normalizable, and give always finite and unique values to the probability [7, 8]. Observables derived from the probability $P = \Gamma T + P^{(d)}$ can be measured with experiments. Γ from $S[T]$ agrees with the rate computed with the Fermi's golden rule. At a small T , or $\Gamma \approx 0$, $P^{(d)}$ is inevitable and more important than ΓT , and determines the physical phenomena. $P^{(d)}$ does not satisfy the conservation law of the detectable energy, due to the wave interaction-energy, and arises in the large space-time region for light particles. In various processes $\Gamma = 0$, but $P^{(d)} \neq 0$. Then $P^{(d)}$ leads unusual phenomena in the forward direction which are forbidden from ΓT term. $P^{(d)}$ appears significant in the extreme light particles.

The standard S-matrix, denoted as $S[\infty]$, is defined normally with plane waves at $T = \infty$, under the adiabatic switch off of the interaction at $T < \infty$ [9–15]. This uses the interaction Hamiltonian $e^{-\epsilon|t|}H_{int}$ and the limit $T \rightarrow \infty$ first and $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ next, and is mathematically beautiful. This is applied to the non-normalizable states as well, and the decay rates and the cross sections are computed and agree with those obtained from FQM and with experiments in most cases. However, this is the method for computing the asymptotic values, and it is a different matter if the experimental values have corrections from the asymptotic values as pointed out in [16, 17]. In the previous papers, it was found that the physical values measured in experiments are in fact subject to the corrections due to $P^{(d)}$ in various processes of light particles. Reactions of the waves that overlap lead a value which varies with the boundary conditions, and are not treated by the standard $S[\infty]$. A naive calculation of the probability in these situations without the adiabatic switching off of the interaction leads the divergence¹. This is a consequence of the approximation [1] by the plane waves, and does not occur in

¹ This divergence is familiar but has not been paid much attention by researchers, and was explained in

realistic case, where $P^{(d)}$ is finite. These transitions are understandable with $P = \Gamma T + P^{(d)}$, and the fundamental parameters of the Lagrangian included in Γ are obtained only when the analysis are made including $P^{(d)}$. If that were ignored, the consistent values would not be obtained.

We investigate these subtle problems in transition processes of Quantum Electrodynamics (QED). QED is the fundamental theory and understood well, and is valid in great precision for the terms derived from the Fermi's golden rule and the transition probabilities derived from $S[\infty]$ [18, 19]. QED gives basis to wide area of natural science, and the new component in the transition probability, regardless of its magnitude, influences the phenomena and our understandings in a great extent. Moreover, the probability in the extreme forward direction has not been clarified, and those in many processes are still unknown. Observations is hard due to the ambiguity caused by the leftover incident particles. From the value of a physical quantity $P(\theta)$ at an angle θ , the value $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} P(\theta)$ can be obtained. However, $P^{(d)}$ is independent of this limit $P(\theta \rightarrow 0)$, and is obtained by a direct observation there. Hence the detection is hard, and $P^{(d)}$ has not been paid serious attention by researchers. Nevertheless, the processes in nature follow the total probability $\Gamma T + P^{(d)}$, regardless of the observability. $P^{(d)}$ is as important as ΓT .

In a potential scattering, the scattering-into-cones theorem [20] that the probability depends on only angle has a correction, when the next order term proportional to $\frac{1}{r^2}$ becomes non-negligible. This is similar to $P^{(d)}$.

The Thomson scattering, pair annihilation, and two photon scattering are fundamental processes that determine and control many physical processes. Their probabilities are considered exactly known, and applied to wide phenomena. If they have new corrections, they could modify some of the standard view on nature. Conversely, it is important to find $P^{(d)}$ and to clarify its implications. $P^{(d)}$ is computed with FQM. Since a typical scale $\frac{\hbar E}{m_\gamma^2 c^3}$ is large in dilute systems, where m_γ is the photon's effective mass in matter determined by the plasma frequency, and much larger than the de Broglie length, macroscopic quantum effects of intriguing properties in dilute systems are derived. These would be crucial for environmental problems in such systems as atmosphere and others. In majority places the natural unit $\hbar = 1, c = 1$ is used.

This paper is organized in the following manner. In Section 2, the unique properties

Appendix of Ref.[1].

of QCS in the particle decay in the extreme forward direction are presented. In Section 3, the S-matrix which incorporates the overlap of waves at a finite time interval, $S[T]$, is introduced. To find the values, the states are described by normalized wave functions, the wave packets, following FQM. The algebra of the wave packets and the formalism in the two body scattering are summarized in Section 4. QED processes are studied in Section 5. In Section 6 and 7 we study implications and summary. Connections of QCS and $P^{(d)}$ with the principles of the quantum mechanics and the statistical mechanics are presented in the Appendix.

II. QUASI-STATIONARY COMPOSITE STATES

A many-body wave function evolves following the Schrödinger equation, and becomes a superposition of many-body states by an interaction Hamiltonian. The wave function is composed of overlapping waves in the extreme forward direction of various unusual properties such as a many-body interaction energy, a continuous kinetic-energy, and others, and of non-overlapping waves. The latter has been studied well in the literature but the former has not. This is an example of QCS and gives unusual transition probability there. Those of decays studied in [1–3] are applied in a scalar theory. A brief summary gives insight to these phenomena.

A system of a scalar field $\varphi_1(x)$ and $\varphi_2(x)$ described by an action

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \int d^4x (L_0 + L_{int}), \\ L_0 &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_l \partial_\mu \varphi_l(x) \partial^\mu \varphi_l(x) + L_{mass} \\ L_{mass} &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_l m_l^2 \varphi_l(x)^2, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $m_2 > 2m_1$ and L_{int} can be any polynomials of the fields, and an interaction Lagrangian

$$L_{int} = -g(\varphi_2(x)\varphi_1(x)^2 + h.c.), \tag{3}$$

where $h.c.$ stands for the hermitian conjugate, is studied. An interaction Lagrangian given in Appendix Eq.(C3) will be also studied. The energy-momentum tensor is given by the mass and interaction terms,

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \sum_l \partial_\mu \varphi_l(x) \partial_\nu \varphi_l(x) - g_{\mu\nu} (L_{mass} + L_{int}). \tag{4}$$

The energy-momentum vector is the integral of the tensor

$$P^\nu = \int d\vec{x} T^{0\nu} \quad (5)$$

and the Hamiltonian $H = P^0$ describes the evolution of the state. The field is expanded in a set of momentum eigenstates,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\vec{x}, t) &= \int d\vec{p} e^{i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}} \rho(\vec{p}) a(\vec{p}, t) + h.c., \quad \rho(\vec{p}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^3 2E(\vec{p})}}, \\ [a(\vec{p}_1, t_1), a^\dagger(\vec{p}_2, t_2)] \delta(t_1 - t_2) &= \delta(\vec{p}_1 - \vec{p}_2) \delta(t_1 - t_2). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

A wave function $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ follows a many-body Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\Psi(t)\rangle = (H_0 + H_{int}) |\Psi(t)\rangle, \quad (7)$$

where H_0 and H_{int} are defined from L_0 and L_{int} of Eqs.(2) and (3), and a solution is written with the operator $U(t, t_0)$ as

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = U(t, t_0) |\Psi(t_0)\rangle. \quad (8)$$

In the interaction representation,

$$\begin{aligned} U(t, t_0) &= \int_{t_0}^t dt_1 \mathcal{T} e^{-iH_{int}t_1/\hbar} = 1 + \int_{t_0}^t \frac{dt_1}{\hbar} (-iH_{int}(t_1)) \\ &+ \int_{t_0}^t \frac{dt_1}{\hbar} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \frac{dt_2}{\hbar} ((-i)^2 H_{int}(t_1) H_{int}(t_2)) + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\mathcal{T}$ stands for the time-ordered product, and $H_{int}(t) = e^{\frac{iH_0 t}{\hbar}} H_{int} e^{-\frac{iH_0 t}{\hbar}}$.

In the renormalizable field theory, the divergences due to the high frequency fluctuations in the intermediate states, which have origins in the short distance regions and have universal properties, are absorbed to the renormalized constants. Using the effective Lagrangian written with these constants and fields, they are taken into account. We study the physical effect of the long distance fluctuations, which appear even in the tree levels. Accordingly we focus on the amplitudes in the tree levels.

A. A wave packet

A simplest normalized function that follows the free Schrödinger equation $H_{int} = 0$ in Eq.(7) is a Gaussian wave packet of a central momentum $\vec{P}_0$, position $\vec{X}_0$ and a time T_0 . That is expressed in the momentum representation by

$$\langle t, \vec{p} | \vec{P}_0, \vec{X}_0, T_0 \rangle = \left(\frac{\sigma}{\pi}\right)^{3/4} e^{-iE(\vec{p})(t-T_0) - i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{X}_0 - \frac{\sigma}{2}(\vec{p}-\vec{P}_0)^2}, \quad (10)$$

where σ shows a size in space and the energy is given by a relativistic form, $E(\vec{p}) = \sqrt{\vec{p}^2 + m^2}$. The function retains its shape and is also a Gaussian form in $\vec{p}$ at $t \geq T_0$. A set of the wave packets of the continuous center position and momentum is complete [8] and satisfies

$$\int d\vec{X} \frac{d\vec{P}}{(2\pi)^3} |\vec{P}, \vec{X}, T\rangle \langle \vec{P}, \vec{X}, T| = 1. \quad (11)$$

The wave function in the coordinate representation is obtained by a Fourier transformation

$$\begin{aligned} \langle t, \vec{x} | \vec{P}_0, \vec{X}_0, T_0 \rangle &= \int d\vec{p} \langle \vec{x} | \vec{p} \rangle \langle t, \vec{p} | \vec{P}_0, \vec{X}_0, T_0 \rangle, \\ \langle \vec{x} | \vec{p} \rangle &= (2\pi)^{-3/2} e^{i\vec{p} \cdot \vec{x}} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

and becomes also a Gaussian form in $\vec{x}$ around a new center

$$\begin{aligned} w(\vec{P}_0, \vec{x}, t; \vec{X}_0) &= N e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma}(\vec{x} - \vec{X}_0 - \vec{v}_0(t - T_0))^2} e^{-iE(\vec{P}_0)(t - T_0) + i\vec{P}_0 \cdot (\vec{x} - \vec{X}_0)}, \\ N &= (\pi\sigma)^{-3/4}, \vec{v}_0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} E(\vec{p})|_{\vec{p}=\vec{P}_0} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

at a small $t - T_0$ region. Thus the wave function keeps the shape and moves with a velocity $\vec{v}_0$. At a large $t - T_0$, the function expands.

Since the wave functions Eq.(13) decrease rapidly with $|\vec{x} - \vec{X}_0 - \vec{v}_0(t - T_0)|$ and vanish at $|\vec{x} - \vec{X}_0 - \vec{v}_0(t - T_0)| \rightarrow \infty$, they are normalized and satisfy the boundary conditions of the experiments. The states are normalized and are appropriate for a complete set, as $f(\vec{x}, t)$ of a latter section Eq.(89). The transition probability for the particles prepared at the initial time T_i and observed at the final time T_f of $T = T_f - T_i$, is computed rigorously from FQM. A set of creation and annihilation operators

$$\begin{aligned} A^\dagger(\vec{P}, \vec{X}, T_0, \sigma_1) &= \int d\vec{p} a^\dagger(\vec{p}) \langle t, \vec{p} | \vec{P}, \vec{X}, T_0 \rangle \\ A(\vec{P}, \vec{X}, T_0, \sigma_1) &= \int d\vec{p} \langle \vec{P}, \vec{X}, T_0 | \vec{p}, t \rangle a(\vec{p}, t) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

forms a complete set of many-body states, and is used to construct $S[T]$ [8]. Wave packets for a spinor and a vector field are formed in similar manners.

B. Quasi-stationary composite states

A wave function of a decaying system evolves following Eq.(7), and the solution Eq.(8) is obtained uniquely in the lowest order of the coupling strength g . A time-dependent state

of a heavier field φ_2 of the energy and momentum $(E_2(\vec{P}), \vec{P})$ and a two-particle state of lighter field φ_1 at T is expressed by the wave function,

$$|\Psi(T)\rangle = a_0(T)|\varphi_2\rangle + |\Psi_2(T)\rangle \quad (15)$$

$$|\Psi_2(T)\rangle = \int d\beta f_{\beta\varphi_2}|\beta\rangle \quad (16)$$

where $a_0(t)$ is a c-number, and the amplitude $f_{\beta\varphi_2}$ is given from Eq.(7) [5, 6] in the form,

$$f_{\beta\varphi_2} = -i \int_0^T dt \langle \beta | H_{int}(t) | \varphi_2 \rangle = iD(\omega, t) F_{\varphi_2, \beta}(\omega), \quad (17)$$

$$D(\omega, T) = \int_0^T dt e^{-i\omega t}, F_{\varphi_2, \beta}(\omega) = \langle \beta | H_{int}(0) | \varphi_2 \rangle, \omega = E_\beta - E_{\varphi_2}.$$

For a normalized state

$$|\varphi_2\rangle = A^\dagger(\vec{P}, \vec{X}, \sigma_2)|0\rangle, \quad (18)$$

the momentum and the energy spread. At a large σ , the energy and momentum are approximated well with their central values, and the QCS is easily studied. So we present this hereafter. Ψ_2 is the two particles states

$$|\Psi_2(T)\rangle = -ig \int d\vec{p}_1 d\vec{p}_2 \int dt d\vec{x} \rho(\vec{p}_1) \rho(\vec{p}_2) e^{i((E(p_1)+E(p_2))t - (\vec{p}_1 + \vec{p}_2)\vec{x})} w(\vec{P}, \vec{x}, t; \vec{X}) a_1(\vec{p}_1)^\dagger a_1(\vec{p}_2)^\dagger |0\rangle, \quad (19)$$

of the finite norm

$$\langle \Psi_2(T) | \Psi_2(T) \rangle = \int d\vec{p}_1 d\vec{p}_2 |F_{\varphi_2, \beta}(\omega)|^2 |D(\omega, T)|^2, \quad |D(\omega, T)|^2 = 4 \sin^2(\frac{\omega T}{2})/\omega^2. \quad (20)$$

$D(\omega; T)$ has a peak at $\omega = 0$, and a tail at $\omega \neq 0$ including $\omega = \infty$. Accordingly the state $|\Psi_2(T)\rangle$ has two components

$$|\Psi_2(T)\rangle = |\Psi_{(2,p)}(T)\rangle + |\Psi_{(2,w)}(T)\rangle, \quad (21)$$

where $|\Psi_{(2,p)}(T)\rangle$ satisfies $\omega \approx 0$, and $|\Psi_{(2,w)}(T)\rangle$ satisfies $\omega \neq 0$. The norm of $|\Psi_{2,p}(T)\rangle$ is

$$\langle \Psi_{(2,p)} | \Psi_{(2,p)} \rangle = \Gamma T, \Gamma = |F_{\varphi_2, \beta}(0)|^2 2\pi \tilde{\rho}(0), \quad (22)$$

where $|D(\omega, T)|^2$ approximately agrees with Dirac's delta function [4, 5],

$$|D(\omega, T)|^2 = 2\pi T \delta(\omega), \quad (23)$$

and $\tilde{\rho}(0)$ is the density of the two particle states at $\omega = 0$. The square of norm of $\Psi_{(2,w)}(T)$,

$$\langle \Psi_{(2,w)} | \Psi_{(2,w)} \rangle = P^{(d)} = \int_{\omega \neq 0} d\vec{p}_1 d\vec{p}_2 |F_{\varphi_2, \beta}|^2 |D(\omega, T)|^2 \quad (24)$$

includes $\omega = \infty$ and a term that is independent of time at $T \rightarrow \infty$ [21]. The norm of the parent at T is

$$|a_0|^2 = 1 - T\Gamma - P^{(d)}, \quad (25)$$

and is affected by both components. In a small T , the integral Eq.(24) is not a constant, but varies steeply to reach the constant [1, 2]. The QCS and its physical effects appear rapidly and remain. Depending on the following interaction energy,

$$E_{int} = \langle \Psi(T) | H_{int} | \Psi(T) \rangle = \int d\vec{p}_1 d\vec{p}_2 \omega |F_{\varphi_2, \beta}(\omega)|^2 |D(\omega, T)|^2, \quad (26)$$

the state is written generally as

$$|\Psi(T)\rangle = |\Psi_{(p)}(T)\rangle + |\Psi_{(w)}(T)\rangle \quad (27)$$

$$\langle \Psi_{(p)} | H_{int} | \Psi_{(p)} \rangle = 0, \langle \Psi_{(w)} | H_{int} | \Psi_{(w)} \rangle \neq 0,$$

now,

$$|\Psi_{(p)}(T)\rangle = a_0(T)|\varphi_2\rangle + |\Psi_{(2,p)}(T)\rangle, |\Psi_{(w)}(T)\rangle = |\Psi_{(2,w)}(T)\rangle. \quad (28)$$

The state $|\Psi_{(p)}(T)\rangle$ represents the separating parent and daughters and is characterized by the rate Γ . This shows the reaction of rapidly separating waves and follows the Markov nature of the decay [22–27]. Γ is computable with the method of switching off of the interaction.

$|\Psi_{(w)}(T)\rangle$ represents the state of the finite interaction energy and is characterized by the time-independent probability $P^{(d)}$, which represents the reaction of the interacting waves. $\Psi_{(w)}(T)$ is a correlated state similar to a stationary state, and gives significant effect if $P^{(d)}$ is large, which was found the case for light particles [1–3, 16, 28]. From this component, unusual phenomena occur and finite observable quantities are derived. $\Psi_{(w)}(T)$ is a quasi-stationary composite states (QCS) of features; (1) macroscopically extended, (2) the continuous spectrum of kinetic energy, (3) T -independent norm, Eq.(24), (4) finite interaction energy. QCS accompany the decaying states in the normal cases.

In an interaction Eq.(C3),

$$F_{\varphi_\mu, \beta}(0) = 0, \Gamma = 0 \quad (29)$$

$$\Psi_{\varphi_\mu, p} = 0,$$

the rate vanishes. The particles in the wave function

$$|\Psi(T)\rangle = a_0(T)|\varphi_2\rangle + |\Psi_{(2,w)}(T), \quad (30)$$

$$|a_0(T)|^2 = 1 - P^{(d)}$$

do not separate, but overlap with the constant probability. This state is not stationary and varies with time, but the probability is time-independent. QCS does not accompany a normal component of the decaying particles.

C. Correlations of QCS

1. Off diagonal order

QCS Eq.(15) is characterized by the correlation functions of the fields,

$$D_2(x_1, x_2) = \langle 0 | \varphi_1(x_1) \varphi_1(x_2) | \Psi \rangle, \quad (31)$$

which becomes from Eq.(15)

$$D_2(x_1, x_2) = ig \int d\vec{p}_1 d\vec{p}_2 \int dt d\vec{x} \rho(\vec{p}_1)^2 \rho(\vec{p}_2)^2 \quad (32)$$

$$e^{i((E(p_1)+E(p_2))t - (\vec{p}_1 + \vec{p}_2) \cdot \vec{x} - p_1 \cdot x_1 + p_2 \cdot x_2)} w(\vec{P}, \vec{x}, t; \vec{X}).$$

Thus QCS is highly correlated in space-time positions, and shows unusual behaviors. QCS has the continuous energy and mass spectrum, and is not manifestly invariant under the Poincare transformation. The probability $P^{(d)}$ reflects these properties and are not manifestly invariant. Under the Lorentz transformation of the whole system, the probability is invariant. Further account on the space-time symmetry of QCS was given in [2]. QCS is different from a bound state (BS), which is tightly bound stationary state in microscopic scale and behaves as a particle in covariant manner under the Poincare transformation.

2. Energy-momentum of QCS

The $\Psi_{(w)}(t)$ has a continuous kinetic-energy unique to the overlapping waves different from that of an isolated particle.

Energy-momentum

The expectation values of the total kinetic and interaction energies from Eq.(15)

$$\langle E_{kin} \rangle = \langle \Psi | H_0 | \Psi \rangle, \quad (33)$$

$$\langle E_{int} \rangle = \langle \Psi | H_{int} | \Psi \rangle,$$

are

$$\langle E_{kin} \rangle = E_2(\vec{P}) - \langle E_{int} \rangle, \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle E_{int} \rangle &= \int_{\omega \neq 0} d\vec{p}_1 d\vec{p}_2 (E_{total} - E(\vec{p}_1) - E(\vec{p}_2)) |D(\omega, T)|^2 |F_{\varphi_2, \beta}(\omega)|^2, \\ &= 2 \int d\vec{p}_1 \left(\frac{E_{total}}{2} - E(\vec{p}_1) \right) \int d\vec{p}_2 |D(\omega, T)|^2 |F_{\varphi_2, \beta}|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where E_{total} is the total energy and agrees with $E_2(\vec{P})$. In the last part, a symmetric nature of the two particle wave function was used. Thus the interaction energy depends on the single particle spectrum.

Single particle spectrum

A single-particle distribution of the particle φ_1 is given by the spectrum of the other from Eq.(20) as

$$\frac{dP(\vec{p}_1)}{d\vec{p}_1} = \int_{\omega \neq 0} d\vec{p}_2 |D(\omega, T)|^2 |F_{\varphi_2, \beta}(\omega)|^2. \quad (36)$$

The integrand at $|\vec{p}_2| \rightarrow \infty$ is most important, [1, 2], for this spectrum and the wave interaction-energy from Eq.(35). The average energy was found about a half of the kinetic-energy conserving value. This shows a kind of Virial theorem. Thus the interaction energy is positive, and the total energy E_{total} is larger than an energy estimated from the single-particle distribution by about a factor two.

Space-time symmetry of QCS

QCS is a superposition of continuous mass of a spectrum $\rho_{qcs}(m^2)$,

$$|\Psi; QCS\rangle = \int dm^2 \rho_{qcs}(m^2) |\Psi; P^2 = m^2\rangle, \quad (37)$$

where $P^2 = (E_1 + E_2)^2 - (\vec{p}_1 + \vec{p}_2)^2$. This mass is that of the visible energy and momentum as is shown later. Thus the visible energy and momentum does not reveal Lorenz invariant. This differs from a bound state, which belongs to an irreducible representations

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi; P_\mu\rangle &= U(\Lambda)|\Psi; P_i = 0\rangle, \\ P^2 &= M^2. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

3. Order parameter of QCS

QCS is the state that has an expectation value of the interaction Hamiltonian

$$O_{qcs} = \langle \Psi | H_{int} | \Psi \rangle. \tag{39}$$

Accordingly, O_{qcs} is an order parameter for QCS. A state is QCS if $O_{qcs} \neq 0$, and is not if $O_{qcs} = 0$. $\Psi_{(w)}(x)$ in Eq.(27) and $\Psi(x)$ in (30) have $O_{qcs} \neq 0$ and are QCS, but $\Psi_{(p)}$ has $O_{qcs} = 0$, and is not. QCS in scattering processes are also identified by this order parameter. If all the states of Eq.(7) at $t \rightarrow \infty$ have the value $O_{qcs} = 0$, QCS does not appear. These states are particle-like states that conserve the kinetic energy.

In the adiabatic switching off of the interaction, it follows that

$$O_{qcs} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \langle \Psi | e^{-\epsilon|t|} H_{int} | \Psi \rangle = 0. \tag{40}$$

Accordingly all the asymptotic states are particle-like states that satisfy the kinetic energy conservation. It is noted that these are derived from the particular interaction that vanishes in the asymptotic regions. In the general situation, the interaction does not vanish there, and remains. It is a dynamical problem if there remain the states of $O_{qcs} \neq 0$. The scattering in the space of $O_{qcs} = 0$ is described by the method of the adiabatic switching off of the interaction, and the transition amplitude and the probability are computed with this. If the state of $O_{qcs} \neq 0$ is included in the final state, that contributes to the transition, and must be included. The methods of $O_{qcs} = 0$ is not exact and gets corrections for the scattering that includes QCS. This problem arises in the tree level of the perturbative expansion, and is not related with the higher order corrections. To clarify and solve this problem, we study without assuming the adiabatic switching off of the interaction. Accordingly, the method of Tomonaga-Schwinger-Feynman [29–31] developed for studying the higher order corrections in QED for $O_{qcs} = 0$ is not useful now. In the tree level, the Schrödinger equation has no

ambiguity, and is best for the study of QCS and $P^{(d)}$. Hence, we study the wave functions from the Schrödinger equation of the interaction Hamiltonian H_{int} instead of $e^{-\epsilon|t|}H_{int}$, and study QCS and its effects. The transitions to the QCS, which are not derived from the method of the adiabatic switching off, are studied and their probabilities are computed.

D. Phase of the wave function

A plane wave in relativistic systems $e^{i(E(\vec{p})t - \vec{p} \cdot \vec{x})}$ behaves at $p = |\vec{p}| = \infty$, and $\vec{x} = ct\vec{n}$, $\vec{n} = \frac{\vec{p}}{p}$, particular way. The energy agrees approximately $E(\vec{p}) = \sqrt{\vec{p}^2 + m^2} \approx p + \frac{m^2}{2p}$, and the phase factor agrees with $\frac{m^2 t}{2p}$. This vanishes in the limit $p \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, a superposition of waves of the infinite momentum becomes singular. A combination of the phases

$$\phi = (E_i - E_f)t - (\vec{p}_i - \vec{p}_f) \cdot \vec{x} \quad (41)$$

also satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &\rightarrow 0, p_f \rightarrow \infty, \\ |\vec{x}| &= ct. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

These waves become real. The singular behavior in the extreme forward direction, remains even at $t \rightarrow \infty$. Now this wave function varies with time and is different from the stationary states. In the system of many-body interaction, they have the interaction energy. Hence the kinetic energy becomes less than the total energy. These are quasi-stationary composite states (QCS).

At a finite angle between $\vec{x}$ and $\vec{p}$, the above cancellation of the phases does not occur. The phase varies rapidly with the distance, and the overlap integral vanishes immediately. The final states separate quickly and do not return to the initial state. The each state behaves like a particle, and the probability is described by the Fermi's golden rule. The state follows the exact kinetic energy conservation. We will see that the two components of the waves are connected with two components of the probability as in Table 1.

Probability	Phase change	Phase magnitude	Particle or Wave
ΓT	time dependent phase	large	particle
$P^{(d)}$	time independent phase	small	wave

TABLE I. Two components of the probabilities ΓT and $P^{(d)}$ and wave functions

E. Norm of QCS

From the norm of QCS, a size of the Hilbert space of QCS is found. The operator in Eq.(8) is unitary, $U^\dagger(t, t_0)U(t, t_0) = 1$, and is written for $|U(t, t_0)| \approx 1$, as

$$U(t, t_0) = 1 + iK(t, t_0), K(t, t_0) = \int_{t_0}^t dt_1 \tilde{K}(t_1) \quad (43)$$

$$i(K(t, t_0) - K^\dagger(t, t_0)) + K(t, t_0)K^\dagger(t, t_0) = 0,$$

where $\tilde{K}(t_1) = H_{int}(t_1) + \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 H_{int}(t_1)H_{int}(t_2) + \dots$, is the integrand of $K(t, t_0)$. Substituting a one-particle state $|\alpha\rangle$ and a complete set $|n\rangle$, we have the matrix elements,

$$\langle n|K(t, t_0)|\alpha\rangle = D(\delta t, \omega)\langle n|\tilde{K}(t_0)|\alpha\rangle, \omega = E_\alpha - E_n, \delta t = t - t_0 \quad (44)$$

$$\langle \alpha|K(t, t_0)K^\dagger(t, t_0)|\alpha\rangle = |D(\delta t, \omega)|^2|\langle \alpha|\tilde{K}(t_0)|n\rangle|^2,$$

and

$$\langle \alpha|K(t, t_0) - K^\dagger(t, t_0)|\alpha\rangle = -i|D(\delta t, \omega)|^2|\langle \alpha|\tilde{K}(t_0)|n\rangle|^2. \quad (45)$$

1. Effect of ΓT : T -dependent norm

$D(\delta t, \omega)$ for large δt and $\omega \approx 0$ follows the kinetic energy conservation,

$$D(\delta t, \omega) = 2\pi\delta(\omega), \quad (46)$$

$$|D(\delta t, \omega)|^2 = \delta t 2\pi\delta(\omega),$$

and

$$2\text{Im}\langle \alpha|K(t, t_0)|\alpha\rangle = 2\pi\delta(0)\Gamma = \delta t\Gamma, \quad (47)$$

where

$$\Gamma = 2\pi \int d\beta_f \delta(\omega) |\langle \beta_f|\tilde{K}(t_0)|\alpha\rangle|^2. \quad (48)$$

From unitarity, at an arbitrary δt ,

$$|\langle \alpha | U(t, t_0) | \alpha \rangle|^2 = 1 - \int_{\beta \neq \alpha} d\beta |\langle \beta | U(t, t_0) | \alpha \rangle|^2. \quad (49)$$

In a case of small $|K(t, t_0)|$,

$$|\langle \alpha | U(t, t_0) | \alpha \rangle|^2 = 1 - \int_{\beta \neq \alpha} d\beta |\langle \beta | U(t, t_0) | \alpha \rangle|^2 = 1 - \delta t \Gamma. \quad (50)$$

In a case of larger $|K(t, t_0)|$, and $|\langle \alpha | U(t, t_0) | \alpha \rangle| \gg |\langle \beta | U(t, t_0) | \alpha \rangle|$, ignoring the off-diagonal matrix element for a positive small $t' - t$,

$$|\langle \alpha | U(t', t_0) | \alpha \rangle|^2 = |\langle \alpha | U(t', t) U(t, t_0) | \alpha \rangle|^2 = |\langle \alpha | U(t, t_0) | \alpha \rangle|^2 (1 - (t' - t) \Gamma). \quad (51)$$

Thus it follows for a large T that

$$|\langle \alpha | U(t + T, t) | \alpha \rangle|^2 = e^{-T\Gamma}, \quad (52)$$

$$\sum_{\beta \neq \alpha} |\langle \beta | U(t + T, t) | \alpha \rangle|^2 = 1 - e^{-T\Gamma}. \quad (53)$$

2. Effect of $P^{(d)}$: T -independent norm

The interaction Eq.(C3) gives a surface term to the action integral and does not affect the equation of the motion. Nevertheless, that modifies the wave function and causes the transition of the amplitude,

$$|\langle \beta_f | \tilde{K}(t_0) | \alpha \rangle| = 0, \omega = 0. \quad (54)$$

The probability that conserves the kinetic energy vanishes but that non-conserves does not. The functions

$$D(t, \omega) = f_m(\omega), \quad (55)$$

$$|D(t, \omega)|^2 = |f_m(\omega)|^2,$$

at a large t oscillates with t , and the average over ω is independent of t and smooth with respect to the kinetic energy. For a small $|K(t)|$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\omega \neq 0} d\beta |\langle \beta | U(t) | \alpha \rangle|^2 &= P^{(d)}, \\ |\langle \alpha | U(t) | \alpha \rangle|^2 &= 1 - P^{(d)}, \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

which is not proportional to t but constant. In the case of a large $K(t)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\omega \neq 0} d\beta |\langle \beta | U(t) | \alpha \rangle|^2 &= \frac{P^{(d)}}{1 + P^{(d)}}, \\ |\langle \alpha | U(t) | \alpha \rangle|^2 &= \frac{1}{1 + P^{(d)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

The probability that the initial state $|\alpha\rangle$ remains is constant in time. This unique property of QCS was identified in processes of violating the helicity suppression of the decay $0^- \rightarrow l + \nu$ [1, 2] and of the Landau-Yang's theorem in the decay $1^+ \rightarrow 2\gamma$ [3].

$P^{(d)}$ varies rapidly in an extremely small T region. The facts that its velocity is high and the time scale is short were found in the particle decays. The scatterings studied later show the same behavior.

3. Effect of Γ and $P^{(d)}$

In general interaction, the amplitude does not vanish at $\omega = 0$ and in $\omega \neq 0$, and the probability has ΓT and $P^{(d)}$. For the case $P^{(d)} \gg \Gamma T$, the probabilities are

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \alpha | U(T) | \alpha \rangle|^2 &= \frac{1}{1 + P^{(d)}} e^{-\Gamma T}, \\ \sum_{\beta, \omega \approx 0} |\langle \beta^{(n)} | U(T) | \alpha \rangle|^2 &= \frac{1}{1 + P^{(d)}} (1 - e^{-\Gamma T}), \\ \sum_{\beta, \omega \neq 0} |\langle \beta^{(d)} | U(T) | \alpha \rangle|^2 &= \frac{P^{(d)}}{1 + P^{(d)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

where $|\beta^{(n)}\rangle$ and $|\beta^{(d)}\rangle$ are the kinetic-energy conserving and non-conserving states.

At a large ΓT ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \alpha | U(T) | \alpha \rangle|^2 &= 0, \\ \sum_{\beta, \omega \approx 0} |\langle \beta^{(n)} | U(T) | \alpha \rangle|^2 &= \frac{1}{1 + P^{(d)}}, \\ \sum_{\beta, \omega \neq 0} |\langle \beta^{(d)} | U(T) | \alpha \rangle|^2 &= \frac{P^{(d)}}{1 + P^{(d)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

The initial state disappears, and the final states include the states of conserving the kinetic-energy and those of non-conserving it. The former has the kinetic energy E_α and the latter has roughly $E_\beta \approx \frac{E_\alpha}{2}$, [1]. In that case, the rate of the visible energy over the invisible energy is

$$r_{visible} = \frac{2}{P^{(d)}}, \quad (60)$$

which agrees with $1/5$ for $P^{(d)} = 10$, and vanishes in the limit $P^{(d)} \rightarrow \infty$. The substantial energy is stored in the interacting waves in these cases.

F. Detection of QCS

The interaction of QCS with matters is governed by the interaction Hamiltonian of the fundamental fields at the same or nearly the same positions. Accordingly the transition amplitude is a convolution of integrals of these waves, and the probability is composed of those that follows the Fermi's golden rule Γ and the correction term $P^{(d)}$. The former has the short typical scale of the de Broglie length $\frac{\hbar}{p}$, and holds the conservation law of the kinetic energy and momentum. The latter has the long scale of $\frac{\hbar E}{m^2 c^3}$, and does not conserve the kinetic energy.

1. Interaction with microscopic states in a detector

A reaction of QCS with microscopic states is slightly different from that of the normal states, and a QCS is not detected like a normal particle. Suppose an initial state $|\Psi\rangle$ is a direct product of a microscopic state in the detector with a superposition of a normal particle state and a QCS,

$$|\Psi\rangle = |B\rangle \otimes [|C'\rangle + |\Psi_{QCS}(C, \gamma)\rangle]. \quad (61)$$

B and C' is the particle state in a detector and in the beam, and the QCS composed of a particle C and a photon is expressed by $|\Psi_{QCS}(C, \gamma)\rangle$. For simplicity, the interaction of C with matters is assumed negligibly weak, and a photon interacts with B in the detector by the interaction,

$$H_{int}(t) = \int d\vec{x} J^\mu(x) A_\mu(x), \quad J^\mu = \bar{\psi}_{B'}(x) \Gamma^\mu \psi_B(x), \quad (62)$$

which is assumed local now. The transition amplitude for the state $|\Psi\rangle$ to react with a microscopic state in the detector and to be transformed to a final state $|out\rangle$ is described by

$$\mathcal{M} = \langle out | \int dt H_{int}(t) | \Psi \rangle, \quad \langle out | = \langle C' | \otimes \langle B' |. \quad (63)$$

The particle state $|C'\rangle$ and the QCS $|\Psi_{QCS}(C, \gamma)\rangle$ behave independently in the reactions. The scattering of the former is described by a normal amplitude,

$$\mathcal{M} = \langle out | \int dt H_{int}(t) | |B, C'\rangle, \quad (64)$$




FIG. 1. Diagram that the photon in QCS interacts with the state B in the detector and is detected. Other part of QCS does not interact.

which depends upon the energies of B , B' , C , and C' . That for QCS is,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{QCS} &= \langle out | \int dt H_{int}(t) | \Psi_{QCS}(C, \gamma), B \rangle \\ &= \langle B' | \int dt H_{int}(t) | B, \gamma \rangle \langle C | \Psi_{QCS} \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where the photon in QCS interacts with B , but others do not. That is expressed in Fig.1. The interaction of the photon with B in solid is described by either the Fermi's golden rule, or the correction term. The former amplitude is proportional to the following integral over the time that depends on the wave kinetic-energy proportional to its frequency,

$$\begin{aligned} \int dt e^{i(E_B + E_\gamma - E_{B'})t} F_{B,B'} &\approx 2\pi\delta(E_B + E_\gamma - E_{B'}) \epsilon_\mu F_{B,B'}^\mu, \\ F_{B,B'}^\mu &= \int d\vec{x} \langle B' | J^\mu(0, \vec{x}) | B \rangle \langle C | \Psi_{QCS} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

The photon's kinetic energy is expressed from E_B and $E_{B'}$

$$E_\gamma = E_{B'} - E_B. \quad (67)$$

The transition amplitude depends upon the photon kinetic energy, and so does the probability. The kinetic energy of C and the wave interaction energy decouple from the amplitude, and are irrelevant to the transition. Thus the energy E_γ is detectable in the experiments,

and is able to transfer to other states in the natural processes, but the rest is not. For the transition amplitude by the correction term, Eq.(67) is replaced with

$$E_\gamma \leq E_{B'} - E_{B.}, \quad (68)$$

and the amplitude depends on the photon kinetic energy. If the particle C has some charge that interacts with one of gauge fields, the kinetic energy of C is also detectable in experiments and is able to transfer to other states. In general QCS composed of the constituent particles that interact with an atom or a nucleus, their kinetic energy is detectable, but the wave interaction-energy decouples and is not detectable.

The fact that the kinetic energy is extractable, but the interaction energy is not, is an extension of a transmission law of the energy in classical mechanics. The kinetic energy of a massive body is determined by the velocity, and its transmission to others is easily made by a contact with another of lower velocity. Now the potential energy is determined by the position, and is the same between two bodies in contact with each other, and does not transmit directly. To transmit the potential energy, that is transferred to the kinetic energy first. For instance, a potential energy of the water at a higher position is transferred first to its kinetic energy, and is transmitted next to a turbine or others. That can be used for generating an electricity in the hydro-electric generation. Similarly, the wave interaction-energy of QCS does not appear in the transition amplitude, and is neither detectable with a normal detector nor transmittable to other matter.

It is heuristic to make a comparison of QCS with BS. QCS is loosely bound, but BS is tightly bound in a microscopic region of a finite energy gap and is a stationary state that is stable under the Poincare transformation. The matrix element of an operator $J(x)$ is written by the four dimensional momentum,

$$\langle BS; p_1 | J(x) | BS; p_2 \rangle = e^{i(p_2 - p_1) \cdot x} \langle BS; p_1 | J(0) | BS; p_2 \rangle. \quad (69)$$

This is valid for any operator and bound state that are composed of fundamental fields. Furthermore, for a Poincare covariant state, the matrix element is described by an unitary operator $U(\vec{p}_1, \vec{0})$ as

$$\langle BS; p_1 | J(0) | BS; p_2 \rangle = \langle BS; \vec{0} | U^\dagger(\vec{p}_1, \vec{0}) J(0) U(\vec{p}_2, \vec{0}) | BS; \vec{0} \rangle. \quad (70)$$

The kinetic energy and the interaction energy are not separable, and the amplitude is written with the total one. The total energy is measured in BS, whereas the interaction energy is separated and decouples from the transition and is not measured in QCS.

For a weakly correlated state, such as QCS, the kinetic energy is separable from the total energy, and is detected independently. The wave interaction-energy decouples and is not detectable by the microscopic processes. An example is Feynman's parton model for a nucleon in deep inelastic scattering. That is expressed by three valence quarks and soft sea quarks and anti-quarks and gluons. Their kinetic energies can be probed by the photon or the weak bosons, but the wave interaction-energy is undetectable, and so is invisible. That is like a missing energy. The interaction energy or a boost operator that includes the interaction is non-detectable by the scatterings through the electroweak currents also.

Weakly correlated states appear in wide area. They include halos in nuclei, atoms, molecules, and other larger physical systems such as the star and galaxy. It is challenging to measure the wave interaction energy in these systems [32–34].

2. Interaction with a large wave in space

If B and B' are not in the normal matter, but are extended in wide area, their interaction with QCS is different from those of the previous case. Large $P^{(d)}$ may appear in their processes, and determines the transition. Due to the positive semi-definite interaction energy, these show the kinetic energy

$$\omega = E_\gamma - E_{B'} + E_B \leq 0. \quad (71)$$

The large sizes are realized in dilute systems, or in highly correlated quantum states such as superconductor, super-fluid, and others. A magnetic field or an electric field can have also large spatial extensions. These states keep coherence in macroscopic area, and may couple with QCS. Large $P^{(d)}$ there may be detectable in laboratory or observable in natural processes.

3. Coupling with gravity

Energy momentum tensor is composed of the kinetic part and the interaction part, which is ignorable for uncorrelated plane waves ² but is sizable for the wave interaction-energy

² If the fields are normalized in a volume V , the integral of n -th power form of the fields is proportional to $V^{\frac{2-n}{2}}$, and vanishes for $n \geq 3$ in $V \rightarrow \infty$. The interaction energy of QCS is in the forward angle does not follow this, and remains.

stored in a QCS. Thus the energy momentum tensor is written as,

$$T_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} + T_{\mu\nu}^{(d)}, \quad (72)$$

where the first term is from the kinetic-energy of the waves and the second term is from the wave's interaction energy, which is positive from a Virial theorem in Sec.2.3. The former is equivalent to those of the particle's kinetic-energy and the latter is proportional to the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$.

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} = T_{\mu\nu}(\text{matter}), T_{\mu\nu}^{(d)} = g_{\mu\nu}T \quad (73)$$

The tensor Eq.(72) becomes a source of the gravitational field. The positive definite energy-momentum tensor proportional to the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ from QCS are added constructively, and those of a macroscopic number can form a macroscopic gravitational field. Consequently they affect a motion of a massive body there. Conversely the wave interaction-energy of QCS affects the macroscopic motion of a massive object, but is not detected by the ordinary measurement that uses the standard interaction. The ratio of the two components is

$$r = \frac{T^{(0)}}{T^{(d)}} = \frac{2}{P^{(d)}} \quad (74)$$

The wave interaction-energy gives the equivalent effects as a dark matter or a dark energy [35].

4. QCS in successive transitions

In a cascade decay, multiple quasi-composite states are formed. QCS of the pion decay $\pi \rightarrow \mu + \nu_1$,

$$|\pi\rangle + |\mu, \nu_1\rangle, \quad (75)$$

and that of the successive muon decay $\mu \rightarrow \nu_2 + \nu_3 + e$,

$$|\mu\rangle + |e, \nu_2, \nu_3\rangle, \quad (76)$$

form a hierarchical states

$$|\Psi\rangle = |\pi\rangle + |\mu, \nu_1\rangle + |e, \nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3\rangle. \quad (77)$$

The sum of the kinetic energies $E_\mu, E_e, E_{\nu_1}, E_{\nu_2}, E_{\nu_3}$ and the interaction energies among these waves,

$$\langle \Psi | H_{int} | \Psi \rangle, \quad (78)$$

agrees with the energy of the initial state

$$E_\pi = E_\mu + E_e + E_{\nu_1} + E_{\nu_2} + E_{\nu_3} + \langle \Psi | H_{int} | \Psi \rangle. \quad (79)$$

The last term is the wave interaction-energy, and carries the substantial amount of the total energy. Three neutrinos were expressed as $\nu_i, i = 1, 2, 3$

III. TWO-BODY SCATTERING

QCS formed in the many-body decays are formed also in the scattering. They are studied by an S-matrix defined with the normalized functions $S[T]$, where T is the time-interval, following FQM. $S[T]$ differs slightly from the standard one, denoted as $S[\infty]$. $S[\infty]$ uses the eigenstates of the free system that are invariant or covariant under the Poincare transformation for the initial and final states at the asymptotic time $t = \pm\infty$, where the interaction switches off adiabatically. These waves are plane, and are not normalized. Hence their transition probability can not be defined directly from FQM. In order to follow FQM, the normalized functions, the wave packets, are necessary. $S[T]$ is such S-matrix and satisfies the boundary conditions of the experiments and of the natural phenomena rigorously. The plane waves used in the standard method are simplest and most convenient for the study of the asymptotic values at $T = \infty$, but are not for computing the probability at a finite T rigorously. Scalar fields are studied in this section.

A. Scattering operator at a finite time

A transition probability from a state $|\alpha\rangle$ of the energy E_α , to a final state $|\beta\rangle$ of the energy E_β , in a general situation including higher order corrections is expressed with $S[T]$ defined later and the amplitude $\mathcal{M}$ [5, 6] in the form,

$$\mathcal{M} = \langle \beta | S[T] | \alpha \rangle \quad (80)$$

which includes higher order effects [1–3, 16].

Physical quantities at T are measured and computed precisely with Moeller operators

$$\Omega_{\pm}(T) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \mp T/2} U(t)^{\dagger} U_0(t), \quad (81)$$

where

$$U(t) = e^{-iHt}, U_0(t) = e^{-iH_0 t}. \quad (82)$$

$\Omega_{\pm}(T)$ satisfies

$$H\Omega_{\mp}(T) = -i(\pm)\frac{\partial}{\partial T}\Omega_{\mp}(T) + \Omega_{\mp}(T)H_0. \quad (83)$$

Scattering operator at the finite time T is the product

$$S[T] = \Omega_{-}^{\dagger}(T)\Omega_{+}(T) \quad (84)$$

and satisfies the commutation relation

$$[S[T], H_0] = +i((\frac{\partial}{\partial T}\Omega_{-}(T))^{\dagger})\Omega_{+}(T) - i\Omega_{-}^{\dagger}(T)\frac{\partial}{\partial T}\Omega_{+}(T). \quad (85)$$

The right-hand side in Eq.(85) vanishes for the waves separating each others and the conservation law of the kinetic energy holds. But the overlapping waves has the finite interaction energy, and $S[T]$ does not commute with H_0 . The kinetic energy is detectable in experiments, and conjugate to the time, and the non-conserved states modifies the probability. The matrix element of $S[T]$ between the eigenstates of H_0 has two terms,

$$\langle\beta|S[T]|\alpha\rangle = \delta_{\epsilon}(E_{\alpha} - E_{\beta})f(T)_{\alpha,\beta} + \delta f. \quad (86)$$

where $\delta_{\epsilon}(\delta E)$ is the approximate delta function and the second term vanishes at the energy $E_{\beta} = E_{\alpha}$. The total transition probability is a sum of these terms. When E_{α} and E_{β} are approximate energies of the states $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\beta\rangle$, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} (E_{\alpha} - E_{\beta})\langle\beta|S(T)|\alpha\rangle &= \langle\beta|O(T)|\alpha\rangle, \\ O(T) &= +i((\frac{\partial}{\partial T}\Omega_{-}(T))^{\dagger})\Omega_{+}(T) - i\Omega_{-}^{\dagger}\frac{\partial}{\partial T}\Omega_{+}(T), \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \delta f &= \frac{1}{E_{\alpha} - E_{\beta}}\langle\beta|O(T)|\alpha\rangle, \\ \sum_{\beta} |\delta f|^2 &= \sum_{\beta} (\frac{1}{E_{\alpha} - E_{\beta}})^2 |\langle\beta|O(T)|\alpha\rangle|^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

$S[T]$ that satisfy the boundary conditions for a theory of a scalar field $\varphi(x)$ are expressed by expansion coefficients $\varphi^f(t)$ of the field operator by

$$\varphi^f(t) = i \int d\vec{x} f^*(\vec{x}, t) \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_0 \varphi(\vec{x}, t), \quad (89)$$

where functions $f(\vec{x}, t)$ are normalized and satisfy a free wave equation. The normalized functions decrease fast in space, and a complete set of functions are specified by central values of position and momentum. The state vector is also specified by both variables as $|\vec{p}, \vec{X}\rangle$. The matrix elements of $S[T]$ are defined as $\langle \vec{p}_i, \vec{X}_i | S[T] | \vec{p}_j, \vec{X}_j \rangle$ and depend on the position and momentum. A scattering at a finite-time interval T is defined with asymptotic conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow -T/2} \langle \alpha | \varphi^f(t) | \beta \rangle &= \langle \alpha | \varphi_{in}^f | \beta \rangle, \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow +T/2} \langle \alpha | \varphi^f(t) | \beta \rangle &= \langle \alpha | \varphi_{out}^f | \beta \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

where $\varphi_{in}(x)$ and $\varphi_{out}(x)$ satisfy the free wave equation and the states $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\beta\rangle$ are defined with wave packets. The wave packets which have finite spatial sizes and decrease fast at large $|\vec{x} - \vec{X}|$ ensure that the states are normalized, and that the transition probability is computed following FQM. This ensures also the scattered waves in finite angles separate rapidly and the asymptotic conditions at a finite T are satisfied naturally. The difficulty of the plane waves and the stationary states does not arise, and transition probability including $P^{(d)}$ is computed rigorously.

B. Probability formula

The probability amplitude from the state α at the time $-T/2$ to the state β at the time $T/2$, $\langle \beta | S[T] | \alpha \rangle$ is written in the interaction picture as

$$\langle \beta | S[T] | \alpha \rangle = \langle \beta | U(T/2, -T/2) | \alpha \rangle, \quad (91)$$

The transition probability computed with FQM is finite, unique, and applicable to arbitrary processes. In real processes, the particles or the waves have finite sizes and are expressed by the normalized functions instead of plane waves [37]. They are specified by the positions and momenta, and the expression becomes a little complicated. The simpler formula are obtained from the plane waves, but they are the approximations and not rigorous.

For two particle scatterings, the initial and final states specified by the central values of the momentum and position $(\vec{p}_i, \vec{X}_i)$, the time T_i , and the wave packet size σ_i are

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &= (\vec{p}_1, \vec{X}_1, T_i; \sigma_1, \vec{p}_2, \vec{X}_2, T_i; \sigma_2), \\ \beta &= (\vec{p}_3, \vec{X}_3, T_f; \sigma_3, \vec{p}_4, \vec{X}_4, T_f; \sigma_4).\end{aligned}\tag{92}$$

The amplitude

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}(\vec{p}_1, \vec{X}_1, T_i; \sigma_1, \vec{p}_2, \vec{X}_2, T_i; \sigma_2 \rightarrow \vec{p}_3, \vec{X}_3, T_f; \sigma_3, \vec{p}_4, \vec{X}_4, T_f; \sigma_4), \\ T = T_f - T_i,\end{aligned}\tag{93}$$

depends on these values. For the interacting waves, the kinetic-energies of the states are the visible energies in the ordinary experiments, as was shown in Section II F. Accordingly the dependence of the probability on the kinetic-energy is measured in experiments. For the initial and final states specified by the central values of the momenta and positions, the physical quantities become dependent of these values generally. Large waves overlap and have interaction energies, and the kinetic energy is not exactly conserved.

The total transition probability is written with the momentum and position variables

$$\begin{aligned}P &= \int \prod_{j=3,4} d\vec{p}_j \frac{d\vec{X}_j}{(2\pi)^3} P(\vec{p}_j, \vec{X}_j, T) \\ P(\vec{p}_j, \vec{X}_j, T_j) &= |\mathcal{M}|^2,\end{aligned}\tag{94}$$

where the momentum is integrated over the whole region and the position is integrated over the region of the detector. Due to QCS, $\mathcal{M}$ is decomposed into two components

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^{(n)} + \mathcal{M}^{(d)}\tag{95}$$

of satisfying

$$\mathcal{M}^{(n)};\tag{96}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1,2} \vec{p}_i &= \sum_{i=3,4} \vec{p}_i, \\ \sum_{i=1,2} E_i(\vec{p}_i) &= \sum_{i=3,4} E_i(\vec{p}_i).\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{M}^{(d)};\tag{97}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1,2} \vec{p}_i &\neq \sum_{i=3,4} \vec{p}_i, \\ \sum_{i=1,2} E_i(\vec{p}_i) &\neq \sum_{i=3,4} E_i(\vec{p}_i),\end{aligned}$$

and P is also decomposed into

$$P = \Gamma T + P^{(d)}, \quad (98)$$

where Γ and $P^{(d)}$ are constant. The former shows the particle characteristics and the latter shows the wave characteristics.

C. QCS of relativistic waves

The QCS included in the final state has the interaction energy of the waves. This energy is not measured directly, from Section 2-F, but those measured by a standard detector is the kinetic energy. A probability that a detected particle has a certain momentum is the integral over the whole phase space of the undetected particles. That in Γ is in the finite kinematic region from the conservation law of the kinetic energy, but that in $P^{(d)}$ covers the infinitely large momentum and kinetic-energy. The unobserved states of the infinite kinetic energy contribute to the measured probability, and generates also significant effects.

The importance of these un-measured states in the two body scattering is manifest in a following example. Let the probability of the scalar fields of the masses m_1, m_2, m_3 , and m_4 , $P(\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2; \vec{p}_3, \vec{p}_4; \vec{X}_i)$, for given momenta in the initial state, $\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2$ and $\vec{p}_3, \vec{p}_4$ in the final states [38]. Now infinitely large $|\vec{p}_3|$ or $|\vec{p}_4|$ can give finite contribution to the transition probability. Those for finite $|\vec{p}_3|$ and $|\vec{p}_4|$, the energy difference $\omega = E_1 + E_2 - E_3 - E_4$ is finite. Thus $P^{(d)} = 0$, but for a certain $\vec{p}_3$, and undetected $\vec{p}_4$

$$P(\vec{p}_3) = \int d\vec{p}_4 P(\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2; \vec{p}_3, \vec{p}_4; \vec{X}_j), \quad (99)$$

which include $|\vec{p}_4| = \infty$, and $\omega = \infty$, and $P^{(d)}(\vec{p}_3) \neq 0$ generally. Similarly $|\vec{p}_3| = \infty$ leads the probability $P^{(d)}(\vec{p}_4)$.

The infinite momentum state has a universal property in the relativistic invariant system. The light-cone singularity links these states with $P^{(d)}$. For the case that the interaction Hamiltonian $H_{int}(t)$ is written by a source $J(x)$ and a scalar field φ_3

$$H_{int}(t) = \int d\vec{x} J(t, \vec{x}) \varphi_3(t, \vec{x}), \quad (100)$$

the amplitude is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M} &= -i \int dt \langle \vec{p}_3, \vec{p}_4 | H_{int}(t) | \vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2 \rangle \\ &= -i \int d^4x \langle \vec{p}_4 | J(x) | \vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2 \rangle e^{ip_3 \cdot x} \langle \vec{p}_3 | \varphi_3(0, \vec{0}) | 0 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

The probability is written with the correlation function

$$\begin{aligned} \int d\vec{p}_4 |\mathcal{M}|^2 &= \int d^4x_1 d^4x_2 \Delta(x_1 - x_2) e^{ip_3 \cdot (x_2 - x_1)} |\langle \vec{p}_3 | \varphi_3(0, \vec{0}) | 0 \rangle|^2, \\ \Delta(x_1 - x_2) &= \int d\vec{p}_4 \langle \vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2 | J^\dagger(x_2) | \vec{p}_4 \rangle \langle \vec{p}_4 | J(x_1) | \vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

The $|\vec{p}_4| = \infty$ component induces the light-cone singularity

$$\frac{i}{4\pi} \delta((x_1 - x_2)^2) \epsilon(t_1 - t_2) \quad (103)$$

in $\Delta(x_1 - x_2)$, as is shown in Appendix, in the kinematic region

$$(p_1 + p_2)^2 + m_3^2 - m_4^2 \geq 2p_3 \cdot (p_1 + p_2) \quad (104)$$

In the rest system of the particle 2,

$$\vec{p}_1 = (0, 0, p_1^z), \vec{p}_2 = (0, 0, 0), \quad (105)$$

$$\begin{aligned} s + m_3^2 - m_4^2 &\geq 2E_3(E_1 + m_2) - 2|\vec{p}_3|p_1^z \cos \theta, \\ s &= (p_1 + p_2)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

where θ is the angle between $\vec{p}_1$ and $\vec{p}_3$, and

$$s + m_3^2 - m_4^2 + 2|\vec{p}_3|p_1^z - 2E_3(E_1 + m_2) \geq 2|\vec{p}_3|p_1^z(1 - \cos \theta). \quad (107)$$

In the high energy collision of a large p_1^z , where masses are negligible, the angle satisfies

$$|1 - \cos \theta| \leq \frac{m_2(p_1^z - E_3)}{|\vec{p}_3|p_1^z}, \quad (108)$$

and $|\vec{p}_3|$ satisfies

$$|\vec{p}_3| \leq \frac{m_2 p_1^z}{2p_1^z(1 - \cos \theta) + 2m_2}. \quad (109)$$

$|\vec{p}_3|$ can be arbitrary in this region.

In the center of mass frame, the relations are slightly changed.

The explicit calculations are presented in the following sections.

D. Vertex of scalar fields

1. Transition amplitude and probability

General vertex parts of the particles i, j, k described by symmetric wave packets of sizes

$$\sigma_i, \sigma_j, \sigma_k \quad (110)$$

of an interaction $g\varphi_i(x)\varphi_j(x)\varphi_k(x)$ and have the four-dimensional momenta and the space positions and the time, and masses

$$(E_n, \vec{p}_n, \vec{X}_n, T_n; m_n)(n = i, j, k) \quad (111)$$

has been presented in [8], and is briefly summarized here. i, j, k are chosen from 1, 2, 3 of the previous section. The vertex part in the transition amplitude of i to j and k is an integral over $(t, \vec{x})$

$$\begin{aligned} V(i \rightarrow j + k) &= g \int dt \int d\vec{x} e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_s}(\vec{x}-\vec{x}_0)^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma_t}(t-t_0)^2} e^{R+i\phi} \\ &= g(2\pi\sigma_s)^{3/2}(2\pi\sigma_t)^{1/2} e^{R+i\phi} \end{aligned} \quad (112)$$

for finite values of σ_s and σ_t . They are given in the expressions

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sigma_s} &= \frac{1}{\sigma_i} + \frac{1}{\sigma_j} + \frac{1}{\sigma_k}, \\ \frac{1}{\sigma_t} &= \frac{v_i^2}{\sigma_i} + \frac{v_j^2}{\sigma_j} + \frac{v_k^2}{\sigma_k} - \sigma_s \left(\frac{\vec{v}_i}{\sigma_j} + \frac{\vec{v}_j}{\sigma_j} + \frac{\vec{v}_k}{\sigma_k} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

The center position $\vec{x}_0(t)$ is

$$\vec{x}_0(t) = \vec{x}_0(0) + \vec{v}_0(t - T_0), \quad (114)$$

$\vec{x}_0(0)$ is the position at $t = 0$ determined by the momenta, positions and times. The average velocity $\vec{v}_0$ is,

$$\vec{v}_0 = \sigma_s \left(\frac{\vec{v}_i}{\sigma_i} + \frac{\vec{v}_j}{\sigma_j} + \frac{\vec{v}_k}{\sigma_k} \right). \quad (115)$$

R and ϕ in the exponent are

$$R = R_{\text{trajectory}} + R_{\text{momentum}}, \quad (116)$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{trajectory}} &= - \sum_l \frac{1}{2\sigma_l} \tilde{X}_l^2 + 2\sigma_s \left(\sum_l \frac{1}{2\sigma_l} \tilde{X}_l \right)^2 + 2\sigma_t \left(\sum_l \frac{(\vec{v}_0 - \vec{v}_l) \cdot \tilde{X}_l}{2\sigma_l} \right)^2, \\ R_{\text{momentum}} &= - \frac{\sigma_t}{2} (\delta E - \vec{v}_0 \delta \vec{p})^2 - \frac{\sigma_s}{2} (\delta \vec{p})^2, \\ \delta E &= E_i(\vec{p}_i) - E_j(\vec{p}_j) - E_k(\vec{p}_k); \delta \vec{p} = \vec{p}_i - \vec{p}_j - \vec{p}_k, \end{aligned} \quad (117)$$

where $\tilde{\vec{X}}_l = \vec{X}_l - \vec{v}_l T_l$. ϕ is a function of the momenta $\vec{p}_l$ and posions $\vec{X}_l$,

$$\phi = \phi_0 + \phi_1 \quad (118)$$

$$\phi_0 = \sum_l (\pm) (\vec{p}_l \vec{X}_l - E(\vec{p}_l) T_l),$$

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1 = & -2\sigma_t \left(\sum_l \frac{(\vec{v}_0 - \vec{v}_l) \cdot \tilde{\vec{X}}_l}{2\sigma_l} \right) \left(\sum_l (\pm) (\vec{v}_0 \cdot \vec{p}_l - E(\vec{p}_l)) \right) \\ & -2\sigma_s \left(\sum_l (\pm) \vec{p}_l \right) \cdot \left(\sum_l \frac{\tilde{\vec{X}}_l}{2\sigma_l} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $+$ shows the in-coming sate and $-$ shows the out-going state.

2. Infinite σ_t

In configurations that the σ_s and σ_t are small, the waves overlap in the small regions. Their transitions at $T \gg \sqrt{\sigma_t}$ are described by the probability from the Fermi's golden rule, and the correction term is negligible $P^{(d)} \approx 0$. Now, there are special situations that the waves overlap wide area, and $\sigma_t = \infty$.

$$1. \sigma_i = \text{finite}, \sigma_j = \sigma_k = \infty \quad (119)$$

$$2. \sigma_i = \infty, \sigma_j, \sigma_k = \text{finite}, \vec{v}_j = \vec{v}_k = \vec{v} \quad (120)$$

The first case is trivial. In the second case, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{v}_0 = \vec{v}, \frac{1}{\sigma_s} &= \sum_i \frac{1}{\sigma_i}, \\ \frac{1}{\sigma_t} &= v^2 \sum_l \frac{1}{\sigma_l} - \sigma_s \sum_l \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_l} \right)^2 v^2 = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (121)$$

Then the waves overlap in the large area, and $P^{(d)}$ becomes finite. The energy conservation is modified from Eq.(117) to

$$(E_i - E_j - \vec{v} \cdot (\vec{p}_i - \vec{p}_j)) - E_k = 0, \quad (122)$$

for given non-vanishing $\vec{p}_i - \vec{p}_j$. The energy difference satisfies

$$E_i - E_j - E_k = \vec{v} \cdot (\vec{p}_i - \vec{p}_j) \quad (123)$$

and the solution of $|\vec{p}_j| \rightarrow \infty$ appears and gives the finite $P^{(d)}$.

3. Exchange of on-shell state

A two-body scattering $2 + 2' \rightarrow 1 + 1'$ is a combination of coherent processes of a decay of the particle 2 to a particle 1 and intermediate state 1^i

$$2 \rightarrow 1 + 1^i, \quad (124)$$

and a subsequent reaction

$$1^i + 2' \rightarrow 1'. \quad (125)$$

The transition amplitude is written with the correlation function of 1^i , $G^{(0)}(1^i; x_1, x_2)$ as,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(2 + 2' \rightarrow 1 + 1') &= g^2 \int d\vec{x}_1 d\vec{x}_2 V(2, 1, 1^i; x_1) G^{(0)}(1^i; x_1, x_2) V(2', 1^i, 1; x_2), \\ G^{(0)}(1^i; x_1, x_2) &= \int \frac{d\vec{p}_{1^i}}{2E(\vec{p}_{1^i})} e^{ip_{1^i} \cdot (x_1 - x_2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (126)$$

where $G^{(0)}(1^i; x_1, x_2)$ is that of the on mass-shell states. The light-cone singularity $\delta((x_1 - x_2)^2) \epsilon(t_1 - t_2)$ included in the propagator $G^{(0)}(1^i; x_1, x_2)$, which is long-range in the time difference $|t_1 - t_2|$ and gives the amplitude,

$$g^2 \int d^4x_1 d^4x_2 V(2, 1, 1^i; x_1) \epsilon(t_1 - t_2) \delta((x_1 - x_2)^2) V(2', 1^i, 1; x_2). \quad (127)$$

The amplitude is written generally as

$$g^2 \int d^4x_1 V(2, 1, 1^i; x_1) \int d^4x_2 \int \frac{d\vec{p}_{1^i}}{2E(\vec{p}_{1^i})} e^{ip_{1^i} \cdot (x_1 - x_2) - \frac{1}{2\sigma_s} (\vec{x}_2 - \vec{x}_{2,0})^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma_t} (t_2 - t_{2,0})^2 + R_2 + i\phi_2}, \quad (128)$$

where $\vec{x}_{2,0}, t_{2,0}, R_2, \phi_2$ are the functions of the variables and obtained in a similar manner as before. After the integration over x_2 , we have the amplitude,

$$g^2 \int d^4x_1 V(2, 1, 1^i; x_1) \int \frac{d\vec{p}_{1^i}}{2E(\vec{p}_{1^i})} (2\sigma_s \pi)^{3/2} (\sigma_t \pi)^{1/2} e^{ip_{1^i} \cdot (x_1 - x_{2,0}) + R_2 + i\phi_2}. \quad (129)$$

The modulus of amplitude decreases rapidly as $|\vec{p}_{1^i} - \vec{p}_{1^i}^{(0)}| \rightarrow \text{large}$, where $\vec{p}_{1^i}^{(0)}$ is the central momentum, from R_2 . For the plane waves of 2 and 1 at the position x_1 , the amplitude becomes

$$g^2 \int d^4x_1 e^{-i(p_2 - p_1)x_1} \int \frac{d\vec{p}_{1^i}}{2E(\vec{p}_{1^i})} (2\sigma_s \pi)^{3/2} (\sigma_t \pi)^{1/2} e^{ip_i \cdot (x_1 - x_{2,0}) + R_2 + i\phi_2}. \quad (130)$$

The amplitudes Eq.(129) and (130) includes $2 \rightarrow 1 + 1$ studied in Section 2.

The probability of the two-body scattering is computed from

$$|\mathcal{M}(2 + 2' \rightarrow 1 + 1')|^2. \quad (131)$$

In a particle zone of the first vertex, $V(2, 1, 1^i; x_1)V^*(2, 1, 1^i; x'_1)$ decreases rapidly with $|x_1 - x'_1|$, and the probability is a product of two probabilities of conserving the kinetic energy. Hence the total probability is given by the factorized product of the probabilities

$$\sum_i |\mathcal{M}(2 \rightarrow 1 + 1^i)|^2 |\mathcal{M}(1^i + 2 \rightarrow 1)|^2, \quad (132)$$

where each term is expressed by Γ . In a wave zone, $V(2, 1, 1^i; x_1)V^*(2, 1, 1^i; x'_1)$ decreases slowly with $|x_1 - x'_1|$, due to the state of the large energy E_{1^i} , and the probability is not written by the factorized form, but by

$$|\sum_i \mathcal{M}(2 \rightarrow 1 + 1^i)\mathcal{M}(1^i + 2 \rightarrow 1)|^2. \quad (133)$$

of two components of Γ and $P^{(d)}$.

In a process where 1^i is detected, the probability becomes the product Eq.(132), but that becomes Eq.(133) in a process that 1^i is not detected.

IV. THOMSON SCATTERING

The processes of QED have been studied normally with the Fermi's golden rule, and $P^{(d)}$ has not been included. This section studies QCS and $P^{(d)}$ of Thomson scattering.

Scatterings of the electron and the photon in finite angles in vacuum are described by the Thomson cross section, where the electron mass is the only quantity of mass dimension, other than each energy, and the cross section in the low energy is proportional to m_e^{-2} , and agrees with the value derived from the classical electrodynamics of a point charge [39]. Now, in the extreme forward angle, due to QCS, the transition probability has another term $P^{(d)}$ which is determined by the ranges in space covered by the wave functions, σ_γ and σ_e , and the electron mass. σ_γ is determined by the mean free path of charged fields, and is large in the dilute systems. Accordingly, $P^{(d)}$ is enhanced and can be even larger than ΓT . Their physical effects have implications to broad phenomena.

The amplitudes in a tree level, i.e., the lowest order in $\hbar$, in low energy are evaluated easily with the local effective Lagrangian obtained by an expansion with respect to the coupling constant of

$$L = \bar{\psi}(x)(p\gamma - m_e)\psi(x) - e\bar{\psi}(x)\gamma^\mu\psi(x)A_\mu(x) - \frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}. \quad (134)$$

The low energy photon electron scattering is a fundamental process connected with many phenomena in wide area and their probabilities determine evolution of the physical states, and expectation values of physical observables.

A. Effective low energy Lagrangian

The effective action of the electron and the photon in the low energy region is described by

$$S_{int} = -e^2 \int d^4x d^4y \bar{\psi}(x)\gamma_\mu S_F(x-y)\gamma_\nu\psi(y)A^\mu(x)A^\nu(y), \quad (135)$$

where $S_F(x-y)$ is the electron propagator. Expanding the fields at y around x , we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_{int} = & -e^2 \int d^4x d^4y \bar{\psi}(x)\gamma_\mu S_F(x-y)\gamma_\nu(\psi(x) + (y-x)_\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\alpha}\psi(x) + \dots)A^\mu(x) \\ & (A^\nu(x) + (x-y)_\beta \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\beta}A^\nu(x) + \dots), \end{aligned} \quad (136)$$

and its lowest dimensional term

$$\begin{aligned} S_{int} = & -e^2 \int d^4x d^4y (y-x)\bar{\psi}(x)\gamma_\mu S_F(x-y)\gamma_\nu\psi(x)A^\mu(x)A^\nu(x) \\ = & -e^2/m_e \int d^4x \bar{\psi}(x)\gamma_\mu\gamma_\nu\psi(x)A^\mu(x)A^\nu(x) \\ = & -e^2/m_e \int d^4x \bar{\psi}(x)\psi(x)A_\mu(x)A^\mu(x), \end{aligned} \quad (137)$$

where

$$\int d^4(x-y)S_F(x-y) = \frac{1}{m_e} \quad (138)$$

was substituted. From the Bose statistics, the symmetric part in μ, ν is taken in the final part of the above equation. The gauge invariant expression is

$$\begin{aligned} & -1/m_e \int d^4x \bar{\psi}(x)\gamma_\mu(p_\mu + eA_\mu(x))\gamma_\nu(p_\nu + eA_\nu(x))\psi(x) \\ = & -1/m_e \int d^4x \bar{\psi}(x)[\sigma_{\mu\nu}2[p_\mu, eA_\nu(x)] + (p_\mu + eA_\mu(x))(p^\mu + eA^\mu(x))]\psi(x), \end{aligned} \quad (139)$$

where the first term is the asymmetric part in μ, ν and the second one is the symmetric one. The cross section from Eq.(139) in the low energy limit agrees with the classical Thomson cross section

$$\sigma_{Thomson} = \frac{4\pi}{3} r_e^2, r_e = \frac{\alpha}{m_e}. \quad (140)$$

B. Many-body Schrödinger equation

A solution of the Schrödinger equation of the interacting system

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi(t) &= (H_0 + H_{int}) \Psi(t), \\ H_{int} &= - \int d\vec{x} L_{int}, \end{aligned} \quad (141)$$

in the lowest order of the above interaction is decomposed uniquely into the kinetic-energy conserving term and non-conserving one

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(t) &= \Psi^p(t) + \Psi^w(t), \\ \Psi^p(t) &= a_0(t) |\Psi(0)\rangle + \int_{\omega=0} d\beta e^{i\frac{\omega t}{2}} 2i \frac{\sin \frac{\omega t}{2}}{\omega} |\beta\rangle \langle \beta | H_{int} | \Psi(0)\rangle, \\ \Psi^w(t) &= \int_{\omega \neq 0} e^{i\frac{\omega t}{2}} 2i \frac{\sin \frac{\omega t}{2}}{\omega} |\beta\rangle \langle \beta | H_{int} | \Psi(0)\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (142)$$

The kinetic-energy conserving state, $\Psi^p(t)$, gives the probability proportional to the time interval and is taken into account in a standard treatment of the scattering. Those of non-conserving the kinetic energy, $\Psi^w(t)$, gives the constant term in the time interval, and is ignored normally. That is included here.

For a normalized two-particle states of the electron and photon at $t = 0$

$$\Psi(0) = A^\dagger(\vec{p}_\gamma, \vec{X}_\gamma, \epsilon_\gamma, \sigma_\gamma) B^\dagger(\vec{p}_e, \vec{X}_e, s_e, \sigma_e) |0\rangle, \quad (143)$$

where $A^\dagger(\vec{p}_\gamma, \vec{X}_\gamma, \epsilon_\gamma, \sigma_\gamma)$ and $B^\dagger(\vec{p}_e, \vec{X}_e, s_e, \sigma_e)$ are the creation operators of the photon and the electron of the momentum, position, and spin ϵ_γ and s_e . Their interaction energy is given by

$$\begin{aligned} E_{int} &= \langle \Psi(t) | H_{int} | \Psi(t) \rangle \\ &= \int d\omega D(\omega) \omega |\langle \beta | H_{int} | \Psi(0) \rangle|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (144)$$

which is positive definite. Due to this interaction energy, the kinetic energy of QCS is less than the total energy. The detectable energy in the final states is the waves kinetic energy, and is less than the total energy. The interaction energy is invisible. It should be noted that an energy E_{int} is divergent if all the waves were plane waves. This unphysical divergence appears because the plane waves are not normalized, and is an artifact of the approximation. This does not occur in physical processes, where the range in space covered by the wave functions are finite, and the wave functions are normalized. The finite E_{int} derived from the Schrödinger equation has universal natures and physical implications.

C. One small wave-packet and three large wave packets; (1,3) case

In the case that the initial states and one of the final states are plain waves and a photon in the final state has small size, (1, 3) case, the transition amplitude is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M} &= -\frac{e^2}{m_e} \int d^4x \langle p_{e,2} | J(x) | p_{e,1} \rangle \langle \vec{k}_{\gamma,2}, \vec{X}_{\gamma}, T_{\gamma} | A_{\mu}(x) A^{\mu}(x) | \vec{k}_1 \rangle, \\ J(x) &= \bar{\psi}(x) \psi(x),\end{aligned}\tag{145}$$

where the states vectors and the matrix elements [3] are,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \vec{k}_{\gamma}, \vec{X}_{\gamma}, T_{\gamma} | A^{\mu}(x) | 0 \rangle &= N_{\gamma} \int d\vec{k}_2 \rho_{\gamma}(\vec{k}_2) e^{-\frac{\sigma_{\gamma}}{2}(\vec{k}_2 - \vec{k}_{\gamma})^2 + i(E(\vec{k}_2)(t - T_{\gamma}) - \vec{k}_2 \cdot (\vec{x} - \vec{X}_{\gamma}))} \epsilon^{\mu}(\vec{k}_2), \\ \langle \vec{k}_1 | A^{\mu}(x) | 0 \rangle &= \rho_{\gamma}(\vec{k}_1) \epsilon^{\mu}(\vec{k}_1) e^{i(E(\vec{k}_1)t - \vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{x})}, \\ \langle p_{e,2} | J(x) | p_{e,1} \rangle &= (2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} \rho_{e,1}(\vec{p}_{e,1}) \rho_{e,2}(\vec{p}_{e,2}) \bar{u}_e(\vec{p}_{e,1}) u_e(\vec{p}_{e,2}) \\ &\quad e^{-i((E_{e,1} - E_{e,2})t - (\vec{p}_{e,1} - \vec{p}_{e,2}) \cdot \vec{x})}.\end{aligned}\tag{146}$$

σ_{γ} is the range in space covered by the nucleus or atomic wave function that the photon interacts with, which depends on the environment, and is estimated later. Γ is independent of σ_{γ} , but $P^{(d)}$ depends on it. For the sake of simplicity, we use the Gaussian form in most parts of this paper. From the normalization of the initial state, the numerical constant in the last equation of Eq. (146) has a coefficient $(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}$ of the initial state, and

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{\gamma}(\vec{k}) &= \left(\frac{1}{2E_{\gamma}(\vec{k})(2\pi)^3} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \rho_e = \left(\frac{m_e}{E_e(2\pi)^3} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ N_{\gamma} &= \left(\frac{\sigma_{\gamma}}{\pi} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}}\end{aligned}\tag{147}$$

and $k_\mu \epsilon^\mu(k) = 0$.

Integrating over $\vec{k}_2$ in Eq.(146), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \vec{k}_\gamma, \vec{X}_\gamma, T_\gamma | A^\mu(x) | 0 \rangle &= \theta(\lambda) \left(\frac{(2\pi)^3}{\sigma_\gamma \sigma_T^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_\gamma(\vec{k}_\gamma + \delta\vec{k}) \epsilon^\mu(\vec{k}_\gamma + \delta\vec{k}) \\ &\times e^{i(E(\vec{k}_\gamma)(t-T_\gamma) - \vec{k}_\gamma \cdot (\vec{x} - \vec{X}_\gamma)) - \chi(x)}, \end{aligned} \quad (148)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= (t - T_\gamma)^2 - (\vec{x} - \vec{X}_\gamma)^2, \\ \chi(x) &= \frac{1}{2\sigma_\gamma} ((\vec{x} - \vec{X}_\gamma)_l - \vec{v}_\gamma(x_0 - T_\gamma))^2 + \frac{1}{2\sigma_T} (\vec{x} - \vec{X}_\gamma)_T^2. \end{aligned} \quad (149)$$

Here $\delta k(x)^\mu$ represents corrections due to the expansion of the wave packet that depend on the direction,

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta\vec{k}(x))_j &= -\frac{i}{\sigma_\gamma^j} \delta\vec{x}, \quad \delta\vec{x} = (\vec{x} - \vec{X}_\gamma - \vec{v}_\gamma(t - T_\gamma)), \\ \delta k^0(x) &= \frac{i}{\sigma_\gamma} \delta x^0, \quad \delta x^0 = \vec{v} \cdot (\vec{x} - \vec{X}_\gamma - \vec{v}_\gamma(t - T_\gamma)), \end{aligned} \quad (150)$$

where σ_γ^j for the longitudinal L and the transverse T directions are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_\gamma^L &= \sigma_\gamma \\ \sigma_\gamma^T &= \sigma_\gamma - \frac{i}{E_\gamma} (x_0 - T_\gamma). \end{aligned} \quad (151)$$

The polarization vector satisfies

$$\sum_{\text{spin}} \epsilon_\mu(\vec{k}_\gamma + \delta\vec{k}) \epsilon_\nu(\vec{k}_\gamma + \delta\vec{k}) = -g_{\mu\nu}. \quad (152)$$

$\mathcal{M}$ is obtained by substituting Eq.(148), which is the normalized function, and satisfies the condition for FQM. That is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M} &= -i \frac{e^2}{m_e} N \int d^4x e^{-i(p_{e,1} - p_{e,2} + k_1) \cdot x} e^{i(E_\gamma(t-T_\gamma) - \vec{k}_\gamma \cdot (\vec{x} - \vec{X}_\gamma)) - \chi(x)} \mathcal{T}, \\ \mathcal{T} &= \bar{u}(p_{e,2}) u(p_{e,1}) \epsilon_\mu(\vec{k}_{\gamma,1}) \epsilon^\mu(\vec{k}_{\gamma,2} + \delta k(x)), \\ N &= \left(\frac{(2\pi)^3}{\sigma_\gamma \sigma_T^2} \right)^{1/2} N_\gamma (2\pi)^{3/2} \rho_\gamma(\vec{k}_1) \rho_\gamma(\vec{k} + \delta\vec{k}) \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} \left(\frac{m_e^2}{E_{e,1} E_{e,2}} \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (153)$$

and in the leading order in $\frac{1}{\sigma_\gamma}$, it follows

$$\delta k(x)^\mu = 0, \sigma_T = \sigma_\gamma. \quad (154)$$

This transition amplitude is rigorous including the finite size correction to the Fermi's golden rule.

In the transition probability

$$P = \frac{1}{V} \int \frac{d\vec{X}_\gamma}{(2\pi)^3} dk_{\gamma_2} d\vec{p}_{e,2} \sum_{spin} |\mathcal{M}|^2 \quad (155)$$

the normalization volume V for the initial state is replaced with the volume of the wave packet, and the probability agrees with that obtained from Eq.(155), with

$$\frac{1}{V} \int \frac{d\vec{X}_\gamma}{(2\pi)^3} = 1, \quad (156)$$

[2]. It follows in the leading order of $\frac{1}{\sigma_\gamma}$

$$\int d\vec{p}_{e,2} \sum |\mathcal{M}|^2 = \left(\frac{e^2}{m_e}\right)^2 N^2 \int d\vec{p}_{e,2} \int d^4x_1 d^4x_2 e^{-i(p_{e,1}-p_{e,2}+k_1)\cdot(x_1-x_2)} \times e^{i(E_2(t_1-t_2)-\vec{k}_2\cdot(\vec{x}_1-\vec{x}_2))-\chi(x_1)-\chi(x_2)} \sum |\mathcal{T}|^2. \quad (157)$$

The sum over the spin

$$\sum_{spin} |\mathcal{T}|^2 = \left(\frac{4}{m_e^2}\right)(p_{e,1} \cdot p_{e,2} + m_e^2), \quad (158)$$

is substituted. The integration from the region of $|t_1 - t_2| \approx 0$ gives ΓT and that from the large $|t_1 - t_2|$ gives $P^{(d)}$. The computations are made separately.

D. Computation of the $P_\gamma^{(d)}$ in the (1,3) case

We show that the probability in the time interval T is given by

$$P = \Gamma(Thom)T + P_{Thom}^{(d)}, \quad (159)$$

where the first term is derived from the Fermi's golden rule, and the second term is the correction term.

$\Gamma(Thom)$ is independent of the measurement process and of σ_γ , and easily computed in the limit $\sigma_\gamma \rightarrow \infty$. The integration over the coordinates leads

$$\int d^4x e^{-i(p_{e,1}+k_1-p_{e,2}-k_2)\cdot x} = (2\pi)^4 \delta^{(4)}(p_{e,1} + k_1 - p_{e,2} - k_2). \quad (160)$$

Because the energy is positive semi-definite, the each energy of the final state has an upper bound. We have the probability

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(Thom)T &= T \frac{1}{E_{e,1}E_{\gamma,1}} \int \frac{d\vec{k}_2}{2E_{\gamma,2}(2\pi)^3} \frac{d\vec{p}_{e,2}}{2E_{e,2}(2\pi)^3} (2\pi)^4 \delta(p_{e,1} + k_1 - p_{e,2} - k_2) \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{e^2}{m_e}\right)^2 4(p_{e,1}(p_{e,1} + k_1 - k_2) + m_e^2).\end{aligned}\quad (161)$$

The differential probability and the total one, in the center of mass frame, are

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\Gamma(Thom)}{d\vec{k}_2}T &= T \frac{1}{2E_{e,1}E_{\gamma,1}E_{\gamma,2}E_{e,2}\pi^2} \delta(E_{e,1} + E_{\gamma,1} - E_{e,2} - E_{\gamma,2}) \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{e^2}{m_e}\right)^2 (p_{e,1}(p_{e,1} + k_1 - k_2) + m_e^2),\end{aligned}\quad (162)$$

and

$$\Gamma(Thom)T = T \frac{1}{\pi E_{\gamma,1}(E_{e,1} + E_{\gamma,1})E_{e,2}} (E_{\gamma,1}^2 + 2m_e^2) \left(\frac{e^2}{m_e}\right)^2. \quad (163)$$

The $P^{(d)}$ for the process that the photon is detected is denoted as $P_\gamma^{(d)}$, and is derived from the light-cone singularity due to the electron from Appendix D,

$$\begin{aligned}\int \frac{d\vec{p}_{e,2}}{2E_2} e^{-i(p_{e,1}-p_{e,2}+k_1)\cdot(x_1-x_2)} &= i \frac{1}{4\pi} \delta((x_1 - x_2)^2) \epsilon(t_1 - t_2), \\ (s - m_e^2 - 2k_2(p_{e,1} + k_1)) &\geq 0,\end{aligned}\quad (164)$$

and the integral over the coordinates

$$\begin{aligned}\int d^4x_1 d^4x_2 e^{i\phi_\gamma(\delta x)} e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_\gamma} \sum_i (\vec{x}_i - \vec{X}_\gamma - \vec{v}_\gamma(t_i - T_\gamma))^2} &\frac{i}{4\pi} \delta(\lambda) \epsilon(\delta t) \\ &= (\sigma_\gamma \pi)^{3/2} \frac{\sigma_\gamma}{2} T (\tilde{g}(\omega_\gamma T) - \pi),\end{aligned}\quad (165)$$

where $\tilde{g}(\omega_\gamma T)$, $\omega = \frac{m_\gamma^2}{2E_\gamma}$ was given in Ref.[1, 2]. Here m_γ is the effective photon mass determined by the plasma frequency. The last term $(\sigma_\gamma \pi)^{3/2} \frac{\sigma_\gamma}{2} T (-\pi)$ cancels with the short range term, and we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dP_{Thom}^{(d)}}{d\vec{k}_2} &= \sigma_\gamma \frac{1}{E_{e,1}E_{\gamma,1}E_{\gamma,2}(2\pi)^3} \left(\frac{e^2}{m_e}\right)^2 (p_{e,1}(p_{e,1} + k_1 - k_2) + m_e^2) T \tilde{g}(\omega_\gamma T) \\ &\quad \times \theta(s - m_e^2 - 2k_2(p_{e,1} + k_1)).\end{aligned}\quad (166)$$

The function $\tilde{g}(\omega_\gamma T)$ is proportional to $\frac{1}{T}$ at the asymptotic T and is π at $T = 0$, as is presented in Appendix D. The last term in the integrand shows the momentum region that contributes, i.e., the modified phase space. [1, 2]

For the system of an electron density n_e , the total probability that one photon makes a transition is

$$\Gamma(total) = n_e \Gamma, \quad (167)$$

$$P_\gamma^{(d)}(total) = n_e \times P_\gamma^{(d)}. \quad (168)$$

Thus the transition probability has the constant term $P^{(d)}$, in a similar manner as the decay.

1. *Electron at rest: photon distribution*

The photon distribution in the rest system of the electron, $p_{e1} = (m_e, \vec{0})$ and the photon momentum $k_{\gamma 1} = (E_{\gamma 1}, 0, 0, k_{\gamma 1})$ is given by the phase space

$$m_e(E_{\gamma,1} - E_{\gamma,2}) - E_{\gamma,1}E_{\gamma,2}(1 - \cos \theta) \geq 0 \quad (169)$$

where θ is the angle between the final photon and the initial photon. The integration is made over the region

$$\begin{aligned} k_{\gamma,2} &\leq k_{\gamma,2}^{max}, \\ k_{\gamma,2}^{max} &= \frac{m_e E_{\gamma,1}}{E_{\gamma,1}(1 - \cos \theta) + m_e}. \end{aligned} \quad (170)$$

At a small $\omega_\gamma T$, $\tilde{g}(\omega_\gamma T) = \pi$, the differential probability and the total probability are proportional to T ,

$$\frac{dP^{(d)}}{d \cos \theta} = T \left(\frac{e^2}{m_e} \right)^2 \sigma_\gamma \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{1}{m_e E_{\gamma,1}} \left[\frac{(2m_e + E_{\gamma,1})(k_{\gamma,2}^{max})^2}{2} - \frac{(k_{\gamma,2}^{max})^3}{3} \right], \quad (171)$$

and

$$P^{(d)} = T \Gamma_{eff}. \quad (172)$$

Here Γ_{eff} is the effective rate of the probability

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{eff} &= \left(\frac{e^2}{m_e} \right)^2 \sigma_\gamma \frac{1}{4\pi} E_{\gamma,1} \left[\frac{1}{3} + \frac{3}{2} \xi + \frac{1}{6} \xi^2 \right], \\ \xi &= \frac{m_e}{m_e + 2E_{\gamma,1}} \end{aligned} \quad (173)$$

which is proportional to σ_γ . In a large σ_γ , Γ_{eff} is larger than $\Gamma(Thom)$. Depending on the size σ_γ , Γ_{eff} varies,

$$\sigma_\gamma E_\gamma^2 \gg 1; \quad \Gamma_{eff} \gg \Gamma(Thom) \quad (174)$$

$$\sigma_\gamma E_\gamma^2 \approx 1; \quad \Gamma_{eff} \approx \Gamma(Thom)$$

$$\sigma_\gamma E_\gamma^2 \ll 1; \quad \Gamma_{eff} \ll \Gamma(Thom).$$

In the low energy limit, $E_\gamma \rightarrow 0$, the probability agrees with the classical Thomson cross section.

At a large $\omega_\gamma T$, $T\tilde{g}(\omega_\gamma T) = \frac{4E_{\gamma 2}}{m_\gamma^2}$, and the differential probability is independent of T and is,

$$\frac{dP^{(d)}}{d \cos \theta} = \left(\frac{e^2}{m_e}\right)^2 \sigma_\gamma \frac{1}{\pi^2} \frac{1}{E_{\gamma,1} m_\gamma^2} [(2m_e + E_{\gamma,1}) \frac{(k_{\gamma,2}^{max})^3}{3} - \frac{(k_{\gamma,2}^{max})^4}{4}], \quad (175)$$

and the total probability is

$$P^{(d)} = \left(\frac{e^2}{m_e}\right)^2 \sigma_\gamma \frac{1}{12\pi^2} \frac{1}{m_\gamma^2} m_e E_{\gamma,1} [E_{\gamma,1} + 4m_e - \frac{2m_e + E_{\gamma,1}}{2} \xi^2 + E_{\gamma,1} \xi^3]. \quad (176)$$

2. High energy electron : energy conversion from the electron to the photon

Here we study the behavior of the Thomson probability at a relativistic energy region. In a high energy region, the effective interaction between the electron and the photon is that of the Compton scattering. Nevertheless it is useful to know the behavior and the magnitude of those of the Thomson scattering.

For the parallel case,

$$p_{e,1} = (E_{e,1}, 0, 0, p_{e,1}), p_{\gamma,1} = (E_{\gamma,1}, 0, 0, E_{\gamma,1}), E_{e,1} \gg E_{\gamma,1}, \quad (177)$$

the momentum satisfies

$$k_{\gamma,2} \leq k_{\gamma,2}^{max}, \quad (178)$$

$$k_{\gamma,2}^{max} = \frac{k_{\gamma,1}(E_{e,1} - p_{e,1})}{(p_{e,1} + k_{\gamma,1})(1 - \cos \theta) + (E_{e,1} - p_{e,1})},$$

and the probability is given, for $\omega_\gamma T \ll 1$, by

$$\frac{dP^{(d)}}{dk_{\gamma,2} d \cos \theta} = A(2\pi) T \tilde{g}(0) k_{\gamma,2} (2m_e^2 + (E_{e,1} - p_{e,1})k_{\gamma,1} - k_{\gamma,2}(E_{e,1} - p_{e,1} \cos \theta)) \theta(B) \quad (179)$$

$$A = \sigma_\gamma \frac{1}{E_{e,1} E_{\gamma,1} (2\pi)^3} \left(\frac{e^2}{m_e}\right)^2$$

$$B = (k_{\gamma,1} - k_{\gamma,2})(E_{e,1} - p_{e,1}) - (p_{e,1} + k_{\gamma,1})k_{\gamma,2}(1 - \cos \theta)$$

and for $\omega_\gamma T > 1$, by

$$\frac{dP^{(d)}}{dk_{\gamma,2} d \cos \theta} = A(2\pi) \frac{4}{m_\gamma^2} k_{\gamma,2}^2 (2m_e^2 + (E_{e,1} - p_{e,1})k_{\gamma,1} - k_{\gamma,2}(E_{e,1} - p_{e,1} \cos \theta)) \theta(B) \quad (180)$$

For the anti-parallel case,

$$p_{e,1} = (E_{e,1}, 0, 0, p_{e,1}), p_{\gamma,1} = (E_{\gamma,1}, 0, 0, -E_{\gamma,1}), E_{e,1} \gg E_{\gamma,1}, \quad (181)$$

the momentum satisfies

$$k_{\gamma,2} \leq k_{\gamma,2}^{max}, \quad (182)$$

$$k_{\gamma,2}^{max} = \frac{k_{\gamma,1}(E_{e,1} + p_{e,1})}{-(p_{e,1} + k_{\gamma,1})(1 - \cos \theta) + (E_{p,1} + p_{e,1})},$$

and the probability is given, for $\omega_\gamma T \ll 1$, by

$$\frac{dP^{(d)}}{dk_{\gamma,2}d\cos\theta} = A(2\pi)T\tilde{g}(0)k_{\gamma,2}(2m_e^2 + (E_{e,1} + p_{e,1})k_{\gamma,1} - k_{\gamma,2}(E_{e,1} - p_{e,1}\cos\theta))\theta(B) \quad (183)$$

$$B = k_{\gamma,1}(E_{e,1} + p_{e,1}) - k_{\gamma,2}(E_{e,1} + k_{\gamma,1} - (p_{e,1} - k_{\gamma,1})\cos\theta)$$

and for $\omega_\gamma T > 1$, by

$$\frac{dP^{(d)}}{dk_{\gamma,2}d\cos\theta} = A(2\pi)\frac{4}{m_\gamma^2}k_{\gamma,2}^2(m_e^2 + (E_{e,1} - p_{e,1})k_{\gamma,1} - k_{\gamma,2}(E_{e,1} - p_{e,1}\cos\theta))\theta(B). \quad (184)$$

A is proportional to σ_γ , which is determined not only by the microscopic quantity but also by the macroscopic quantities. The probability is enhanced in a large σ_γ .

E. $P_e^{(d)}$ for the electron in the (1,3) case

For the events that the electron is detected or interacts with others, the wave function of the electron in the final state is determined by the reaction process. That in a solid state is normally atomic size and in a dilute gas is large. $\Gamma(Thom)$ for the electron is the same as that for the photon. $P_e^{(d)}$ is derived and computed from the light-cone singularity of the photon,

$$\int \frac{d\vec{p}_{\gamma,2}}{2E_2} e^{-i(p_{e,1}-p_{\gamma,2}+k_1)\cdot(x_1-x_2)} = i\frac{1}{4\pi}\delta((x_1-x_2)^2)\epsilon(x_1^0-x_2^0), \quad (185)$$

$$(s - m_e^2 - 2p_{e,2}(p_{e,1} + p_{\gamma,1})) \geq 0,$$

and the integral

$$\int dx_1 dx_2 e^{i\phi_e(\delta x)} e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_e} \sum_i (\vec{x}_1 - \vec{X}_e - \vec{v}_e(t_1 - T_e))^2} \frac{i}{4\pi} \delta(\lambda) \epsilon(\delta t) \quad (186)$$

$$= (\sigma_e \pi)^{3/2} \frac{\sigma_e}{2} T(\tilde{g}(\omega_e T) - \pi),$$

where $\omega_e = \frac{m_e^2}{E_e}$ is much larger than ω_γ Ref.[1, 2]. At the small $\omega_e T$, Γ_{eff} is the same as that of the photon, if $\sigma_e = \sigma_\gamma$. At a large $\omega_e T$,

$$P_{Thom}^{(d)} = \left(\frac{e^2}{m_e}\right)^2 \sigma_e \frac{4}{E_{e,1}} \frac{1}{2E_{\gamma,1}} \int \frac{d\vec{k}_{e2}}{2E_{e2}(2\pi)^3} \quad (187)$$

$$(p_{e,1} \cdot p_{e,2} + m_e^2) T \tilde{g}(\omega_e T) \theta(s - m_e^2 - 2p_{e,2} \cdot (p_{e,1} + k_{\gamma,1})).$$

Eq.(187) is almost identical to E.(166) in the form. However, since the angular frequency ω_e is much larger, the magnitude is much smaller.

For the system of a photon density n_γ , the total probability $P_e^{(d)}(total)$ that one photon makes a transition is

$$P_e^{(d)}(total) = n_\gamma \times P_e^{(d)}. \quad (188)$$

1. electron acceleration

In the case $p_{e,1} = (E_{e,1}, 0, 0, p_{e,1})$, $p_{\gamma,1} = (E_{\gamma,1}, 0, 0, E_{\gamma,1})$, the electron's energy distribution is obtained by integrating the photon momentum in the final state first. Accordingly, the phase space and the angular velocity are changed to

$$s - m_e^2 - 2p_{e,2} \cdot (p_{e,1} + k_{\gamma,1}) \geq 0, \quad (189)$$

$$\omega_e = E_e(p, e) - p_e.$$

For $E_e \gg m_e$, $E_{\gamma,1} > 2p_{e,1}$, the frequency is

$$\omega_e = \frac{m_e^2}{2p_e}, \quad (190)$$

and the probability is

$$P^{(d)} = \left(\frac{e^2}{m_e}\right)^2 \sigma_e \frac{8}{4\pi^2} \frac{1}{m_e^2} \int^{E_{\gamma,1} - \frac{p_{e,1}^2}{E_{\gamma,1}}} dE_{e,2} E_{e,2}^2. \quad (191)$$

$$= \left(\frac{e^2}{m_e}\right)^2 \sigma_e \frac{2}{3\pi^2} \frac{1}{m_e^2} \left(E_{\gamma,1} - \frac{p_{e,1}^2}{E_{\gamma,1}}\right)^3.$$

The probability that the electrons get the energy from the higher energy photon is determined by this $P^{(d)}$. The lower energy photon does not give the energy.

The probability $P^{(d)}$ for the photon and the electron are proportional to the square of the electron radius $\frac{e^2}{m_e}$, and to the range in space covered by the photon wave function σ_γ or the electron wave function σ_e . By tuning the latter parameter, the enhancement of

the probability is possible. The asymptotic values for the photon is proportional to $\frac{1}{m_\gamma^2}$ and for the electron is proportional to $\frac{1}{m_e^2}$. Eq.(191) is inversely proportional to m_e^2 , Since the electron mass is much larger than the photon's effective mass, $P^{(d)}$ for the electron is much smaller than that of the photon. However, that is still sizable for a large σ_e , which may be realized in dilute gas such as the atmosphere and the space.

2. The case :(2,2)

In the case that one of the initial states and one of the final states are plane waves and others have small sizes, (2, 2) case, the transition amplitude is given by

$$\mathcal{M} = -\frac{e^2}{m_e} \int d^4x \langle p_{e,2} | J(x) | p_{e,1} \rangle \langle \vec{k}_2, \vec{X}_\gamma, T_\gamma | A_\mu(x) A^\mu(x) | \vec{k}_1, \vec{X}_1, T_1 \rangle.$$

The probability is written with the amplitude.

3. $e + E(B) \rightarrow e + \gamma$

One photon production in the electron scattering with the electric or magnetic field has the probability ΓT and $P^{(d)}$. The cross sections for the bremsstrahlung or the synchrotron radiation are known well. $P^{(d)}$ in the processes that the electron interacts with a macroscopic electric or magnetic field gives a scattering probability in the extreme forward direction. The range in space covered by these photon's wave functions can be much larger than the atomic size, and $P^{(d)}$ can be enhanced over ΓT .

F. Other QED processes

Other QED processes, $e^+ + e^- \rightarrow 2\gamma$ and $\gamma + \gamma \rightarrow \gamma + \gamma$ and others are also subject of the corrections of $P^{(d)}$. $P^{(d)}$ of these processes are expressed in the same manner as that of the Thomson scattering.

V. IMPLICATIONS

In the transition probability Eq.(159), $\Gamma(Thom)$ is smooth in the angle and determined by microscopic physical quantities and de Broglie wave length $\frac{\hbar}{p}$. Now $P^{(d)}$ peaks at $\theta = 0$ and

the value is determined by the macroscopic quantity σ_γ and the microscopic quantity $\frac{\hbar E}{c^3 m_\gamma^2}$, which in fact is of a macroscopic magnitude for the light particles. This forward component is unique in the quantum mechanics and is not derived in the classical mechanics. Even in the low energy limit, the additional component $P_{Thom}^{(d)}$ does not vanish and appears in the extreme forward direction. The QCS and the probability $P^{(d)}$ have implications to wide area. Some of them are studied.

A. Magnitude of $P_\gamma^{(d)}$

The magnitude of $P_\gamma^{(d)}$ in the small and large T regions are estimated.

1. $\omega_\gamma T \ll 1$

From Eq.(174), $P^{(d)}$ is proportional to T in the region $\omega_\gamma T \ll 1$, and the effective rate $\Gamma_{eff}^{(d)} = \frac{P^{(d)}}{T}$ is larger than the normal term Γ for $\sigma E_\gamma^2 \gg 1$. σ_γ is the range in space covered by the wave function of the object that the photon interacts with and is estimated from its mean free path l_{mfp} of the charged matter,

$$\sigma_\gamma = \pi l_{mfp}^2. \quad (192)$$

The mean free path l_{mfp} is given by

$$l_{mfp} = \frac{1}{n_{charge} \times \sigma_{cross \ section}}, \quad (193)$$

where the cross section $\sigma_{cross \ section}$ for the charged particles in plasma, is the Rutherford cross section and for the neutral atoms is $\pi(r_{atom})^2$, where r_{atom} is the atomic size. The mean free path is as long as 10^5 meter or longer in dilute gas but is short in liquid and solid. Thus

$$\sigma_\gamma E_\gamma^2 = \pi \left(\frac{l_{mfp}}{\lambda_\gamma} \right)^2. \quad (194)$$

$P^{(d)}$ is more important than ΓT if the mean free path is longer than the wave length.

2. $\omega_\gamma T > 1$

In the asymptotic region $\omega T \gg 1$, $P^{(d)}$ is constant and proportional to another parameter $r_d = c \hbar n_e \frac{\sigma_\gamma}{m_\gamma^2}$, which depends on the photon's effective mass, m_γ . That is determined by the

plasma frequency,

$$m_\gamma = \hbar \sqrt{\frac{4\pi\alpha N_e}{m_e}}; \quad N_e \text{ the total electron density,} \quad (195)$$

and is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} m_\gamma c^2 &= 30 \sqrt{\frac{N_e}{N_e^0}} eV, \\ N_e^0 &= 10^{30} \text{meter}^{-3}. \end{aligned} \quad (196)$$

Combining this with the σ_γ , and substituting $c\hbar = 2 \times 10^{-7} \text{ eV meter}$, the magnitude in the asymptotic region $T \rightarrow \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} r_d &= c\hbar n_e \frac{\sigma_\gamma}{m_\gamma^2} = c\hbar n_e \pi l_{mfp}^2 \frac{N_e^0}{N_e} \frac{1}{900} \\ &= \frac{n_e}{N_e} \pi l_{mfp}^2 N_e^0 \frac{1}{900} \frac{2 \times 10^{-7} \text{ eV meter}}{\text{eV meter}}. \end{aligned} \quad (197)$$

which is large in dilute systems such as the ionosphere, the solar corona, and the inter space. In the Ionosphere, parameters are roughly $l = 10^7 \text{ meter}$, $n_e = 10^{10} / \text{meter}^3$, and $N_e = 10^{15} / \text{meter}^3$, and $r_d > 1$.

In the processes of $P^{(d)} \approx 0$, the sum of the kinetic energies of final states agrees with the initial energy. QCS is not involved. For the processes of sizable $P^{(d)}$, the substantial portion of the final states have less kinetic energy, and the rest of the energy is stored in the wave interaction-energy. It is remarkable that the $P^{(d)}$ gives physical effects despite the fact that the term ΓT exceeds $P^{(d)}$ at the infinite T .

B. Magnitude of $P_e^{(d)}$

The product $n_\gamma \frac{\sigma_e}{m_e^2}$ determines the magnitude of $P_e^{(d)}$ at $\omega_e T > 1$. The electron mass is much heavier than the photon's effective mass, and $P_e^{(d)}$ is much smaller than $P_\gamma^{(d)}$, if $\sigma_e \approx \sigma_\gamma$.

C. Fraction of the QCS and of the invisible energy

The final state of the Thomson scattering is partly QCS of the continuous kinetic energy. Its average fraction is estimated.

1. Fraction of QCS

For $P_\gamma^{(d)}(total) \ll 1$, the total probability that one photon is scattered in a gas of the electron density n_e , at T is

$$P = \Gamma(total)T + P_\gamma^{(d)}(total), \quad (198)$$

with $\Gamma(total) = n_e\Gamma$, $P_\gamma^{(d)}(total) = n_eP_\gamma^{(d)}$. Hereafter, the fraction of QCS is studied for $\omega_\gamma T > 1$. P becomes the unity at a time T_0 that satisfies

$$\Gamma(total)T_0 = 1 - P_\gamma^{(d)}(total). \quad (199)$$

T_0 is the mean free time of the initial state. By the time T_0 , due to the scattering with the electrons all states are scattered, and transformed to the final states. The sum of the kinetic-energies of the final states by the process governed by ΓT agrees with the initial energy, but that by $P^{(d)}$ is smaller. We estimate the fraction of the former states and of the latter states from those states that are produced in the time interval between $T = 0$ and $T = T_0$ as

$$\begin{aligned} P_{conservig} &= \frac{1}{2}T_0(1 - P_\gamma^{(d)}(total)), \\ P_{non-conserv.} &= T_0P_\gamma^{(d)}(total). \end{aligned} \quad (200)$$

Their ratio is

$$r = \frac{1 - P_\gamma^{(d)}(total)}{2P_\gamma^{(d)}(total)}. \quad (201)$$

For $P_\gamma^{(d)}(total) \geq 1$, the total probability becomes

$$P = \frac{\Gamma(total)T}{1 + P_\gamma^{(d)}(total)} + \frac{P_\gamma^{(d)}(total)}{1 + P_\gamma^{(d)}(total)}, \quad (202)$$

which become $P = 1$ at $\Gamma T_0 = 1$. Those in the time interval between $T = 0$ and $T = T_0$ are

$$\begin{aligned} P_{conservig} &= \frac{T_0}{2(1 + P_\gamma^{(d)}(total))} \\ P_{non-conserv.} &= \frac{T_0P_\gamma^{(d)}(total)}{1 + P_\gamma^{(d)}(total)}, \end{aligned} \quad (203)$$

and the ratio is

$$r = \frac{1}{2P_\gamma^{(d)}(total)}. \quad (204)$$

If the average kinetic-energy of the QCS is $\frac{1}{p_{ke}}$ of the total energy, the average fraction of the observed energy for $P_\gamma^{(d)}(total) < 1$ is

$$\frac{E_{visible}}{E_{total}} = \frac{1}{2}(1 - P_\gamma^{(d)}(total)) + P_\gamma^{(d)}(total) \frac{1}{p_{ke}}, \quad (205)$$

and for $P_\gamma^{(d)}(total) \geq 1$,

$$\frac{E_{visible}}{E_{total}} = \frac{1}{2(1 + P_\gamma^{(d)}(total))} + \frac{P_\gamma^{(d)}(total)}{1 + P_\gamma^{(d)}(total)} \frac{1}{p_{ke}}. \quad (206)$$

If $P_\gamma^{(d)}(total) \gg 1$, the majority of the energy is stored in the wave interaction-energy, and is invisible with the detectors that use microscopic processes.

2. Observation of QCS

The kinetic energy of QCS is visible by its interaction with atoms, but the interaction energy decouples. Hence the energy measured with an ordinary detector is a partial portion, and deviates from the total energy carried by the initial states. This event looks like a background, even though that is represented by the Schrödinger equation and has universal properties.

From unique features that are not included in the normal component of the wave function and Γ , QCS and $P^{(d)}$ can be identified. One way is to measure the absolute values of the total energy and the transition probability precisely. If the total probability to the states of conserving the kinetic energy is less than one, there are missing channel. If that is found to have the less kinetic energy, it could suggest the QCS. QCS will be confirmed if a kinetic energy is transferred from the interaction energy and is detected directly.

The steep rising of $P^{(d)}$ with time in the region $\omega T \ll 1$ is another feature and may be verified. Due to the large width in the kinetic energy, the $P^{(d)}$ changes rapidly, before that reaches to the asymptotic value. This rapid change induced by $P^{(d)}$, may be identified with the advanced laser technology easily. The large width in the kinetic energy also shows that the signal is insensitive to their variations. In an environment of a finite temperature, and a finite density, the energy becomes broad, and the narrow peak due to Γ becomes less prominent, but $P^{(d)}$ is independent of the temperature. Furthermore, $P^{(d)}$ is enhanced in the dilute system, and added to the probability. The total transition probability varies by $P^{(d)}$. These features may make the identification of $P^{(d)}$ and QCS possible.

The interaction energy carried by the overlapping waves directly couples with the gravitational field. Hence, macroscopic number of QCS is observable through their energy and momentum. From the fact that QCS appears in QED, it is expected that QCS affects the quantum mechanical phenomena in wide area. They will be presented in a subsequent work.

D. The comparison with previous experiments

The wave function QCS and the probability $P^{(d)}$ have been barely paid attentions by the researchers. This is because the experimental signals are wide in the energy and narrow in the configuration space in the forward direction. Hence the identifications are hard, [40]. These signals have been considered as backgrounds, and serious studies have been barely made. This does not mean that they do not exist. When $P^{(d)}$ becomes larger than ΓT , that is necessary for correct understandings of the phenomena.

VI. SUMMARY

We found that the solution of the many-body Schrödinger equation at the large time has a new component of quasi-stationary composite states (QCS) of the overlapping waves. QCS has the wave interaction-energy and gives the intriguing corrections to the Fermi's golden rule for the scattering probability. QCS and their transitions, which played important roles in the decays, are also important in the scatterings. Due to their unique properties such as the non-conservation of the kinetic energy and the violation of symmetry, the transition probability, which are computed following FQM for the normalized states, reveal unusual properties. These play important roles in various experiments and in natural phenomena of many-body problems.

The solutions of Schrödinger equation solved with the boundary condition of the adiabatic switching off of the interaction have been applied in many situations, which is realized by the interaction Hamiltonian $e^{-\epsilon|t|}H_{int}$. This method is applicable to the transitions of the states of small sizes, behaving like particles of $O_{qcs} = 0$ in the initial and final states. In this kinematic region, the particle zone, the kinetic energy agrees with the total energy and also with the initial energy. This many-body state is equivalent to free particles, and physical quantities are computed with the $S[\infty]$ of plane waves with the damping factor

$e^{-\epsilon|t|}H_{int}$. The transition probability in the particle zone has the form ΓT , and has been fully understood. It is highly non-trivial, however, if the interaction always switches off. This issue was clarified in this work.

The QCS was analyzed in the scalar theory and in QED, particularly in the Thomson scattering. In the Thomson scattering of the extended states behaving like waves, the solutions of the Schrödinger equation of the interacting Hamiltonian include QCS of $O_{qcs} \neq 0$ which are not expressed by the boundary condition of the switching off of the interaction. The wave functions in the extreme forward direction are example of this case, and keep the wave interaction-energy, and the kinetic energy that deviates from the total energy. The transition process is described by the S-matrix $S[T]$ for the finite-time interval T defined by the normalized states and the probability is computed with the fundamental principles of the quantum mechanics. QCS leads to the transition probability to have the form $P = \Gamma T + P^{(d)}$ of the normal term ΓT and the new term $P^{(d)}$. Γ is computed by the Fermi's golden rule, but $P^{(d)}$ is not. This is derived from QCS and computed by the method following FQM. $P^{(d)}$ has been considered negligible and ignored, but that is found sizable in various situations and giving significant effects. The low energy theorem [39] that the cross section agrees with the classical Thomson cross section is valid in the low energy limit despite the fact the transition probability is modified in the intermediate energy. The critical energy depends on the mean free path of the charge matter and becomes extremely low in the dilute system.

The typical length characterizing $P^{(d)}$ is $\frac{\hbar E}{m^2 c^3}$, which is much larger than de Broglie wave length $\frac{\hbar}{p}$ for light particles. $P^{(d)}$ is proportional to this length and the range in space covered by the wave function σ , and becomes extremely large in processes involving light particles, such as electromagnetic and weak processes. From these dependences, $P^{(d)}$ would be able to supply the valuable information on the physical systems.

Each term of ΓT and $P^{(d)}$ corresponds to the final state of different properties on the kinetic energy. First component is narrow at the initial energy, revealing the kinetic energy conservation, whereas the second is spread in wide region. The implications of the former have been fully studied, and presented in many textbooks, but those of the second have not. The latter has the kinetic-energy smaller than that of the initial value revealing the kinetic-energy non-conservation, and is narrow in time. $P^{(d)}$ in fact varies rapidly in a small T , and approaches constant. The rest of the energy is stored in the waves in the form of the interaction energy. This interaction energy of the waves in the many-body systems, which

is similar to the potential energy in the classical mechanics and in the one-body quantum mechanics, could have many implications.

The wave kinetic-energy is proportional to the frequency by the Einstein relation $E = h\nu$, and transmits from the initial state to another state in the microscopic transition processes. This energy is detectable with the normal detectors, and transmittable to other systems in natural phenomena. Thus this is visible. Contrary to the kinetic energy, the wave interaction-energy is stored in overlapping waves and neither transmittable nor detectable unless that is converted to the kinetic-energy. Hence this is invisible with microscopic processes. Nevertheless, this non-detectable energy is one part of the energy momentum tensor and becomes the source of the gravitational field and affects the macroscopic motion of a massive body. For $P^{(d)} \geq 1$, the dominant part of the energy of the final states is invisible.

Γ is independent of the details of the initial and final wave functions, and has been used to study the underlining theory, whereas $P^{(d)}$ depends partly on the wave functions, and is less useful to study the underlining theory. Nevertheless, that gives other information, and have intriguing properties. Hence this could be useful for applications, and has many implications, especially in the dilute systems. That could change also basic understandings of the natural phenomena [41, 42]. $P^{(d)}$ gives effects similar to a new interaction.

Acknowledgements. The present work is partially supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (Grant No.24340043), and JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 15H05885(J-Physics). The authors thank Dr. Takashi Kobayashi, Dr. Takasumi Maruyama, Dr. Tsuyoshi Nakaya, and Dr.Koichiro Nishikawa for useful discussions on the neutrino experiments, Dr. Asao Arai, Dr. Yoshihito Asai, Dr. Tomio Kobayashi, Dr. Makoto Minowa, Dr. Toshinori Mori, Dr. Sakue Yamada, Dr.Terry Sloan, Dr.Kin-ya Oda, Mr. Hiromasa Nakatsuka, Dr. Toshiki Tajima, Dr. Kiyoshi Kuramoto, Dr. Mitsuteru Sato, Dr. Masaki Takesada, Dr. Tomofumi Mishina, Dr. Shigeto Watanabe, and Dr. Junji Watanabe for useful discussions on quantum interferences.

[1] K. Ishikawa and Y. Tobita, Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.**2013**,073B02. DOI:10.1093/ptep/ptt049

[2] K. Ishikawa and Y. Tobita, Annal of Physics. **344**(2014)118-178

- [3] K. Ishikawa, T. Tajima, and Y. Tobita, Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.**2015**,013B02.
DOI:10.1093/ptep/ptu168
- [4] P. A. M. Dirac, Pro. R.Soc.Lond. A 114,243-265, (1927).
- [5] L. Schiff , *Quantum Mechanics* ,page 197, McGRAW-HiLL, New-York. .
- [6] L. D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitsz, *Quantum Mechanics* page 157, Butterworth Heine Mann, New York, (2003).
- [7] M. Gell-Mann, “The Quarks and the Jaguar: Adventures in the Simple and the Complex” (St. Martin’s Griffin, London, 1995),ILL ed.
- [8] K. Ishikawa and T.Shimomura, Prog. Theor. Phys. **114**, (2005), 1201-1234.
- [9] H. Lehman, K. Symanzik, and W. Zimmermann, Nuovo Cimento. **1**, 1425(1955).
- [10] F. Low, Phys. Rev. **97**, 1392(1955).
- [11] R. G. Winter, Phys. Rev. **123**, 1503(1961).
- [12] M.K.Goldberger and K.M. Watson, “Collision Theory”(Wiley, New York,1965)
- [13] R.G. Newton, “Scattering Theory of Waves and Particles”,(Springer, New York,1982)
- [14] J. R. Taylor,”Scattering Theory : The Quantum Theory of Non-relativistic Collisions2,(Dover, New York,2006)
- [15] See for instance, M. Peshkin, *Quantum Field Theory*, Sect. 7.2, page 222, McGRAW-HiLL, New-York; S. Weinberg,*The Quantum Theory of Fields I*, page 109, Cambridge University, Cambridge; M. Srednicki, *Quantum Field Theory*, page 37, Cambridge University press, Cambridge, 2007.
- [16] M. L. Goldberger and K. M. Watson, Phys. Rev. **136**, 1472(1964).
- [17] There are many cases that the experiments of the same process of the different experimental settings give in-consistent values, especially in the reactions involving light particles. That includes low energy region, such as far-infrared light, and high energy region.
- [18] J. M. Jauch and F. Rohrlich, *Theory of Photons and Electrons*, Addison-Wesley, Boston,(1955)
- [19] T. Kinoshita, *Quantum electrodynamics*, World Scientif, Singapore,(1990)
- [20] J. D. Dollard,Commun. Math. Phys. **12**,193(1969).
- [21] The T-independent term was not discussed in J. von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*(Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1955), P.290, and in [4]. That is convergent and takes a unique value for the normalized states, and is compared with the

experiments and observations. That is not for the non-normalized states.

- [22] B. Kayser, Phys. Rev. **D24**, 110(1981);
- [23] C. Giunti, C. W. Kim, and U. W. Lee, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 3635(1991)
- [24] S. Nussinov, Phys. Lett. **B63**, 201(1976)
- [25] K. Kiers, S. Nussinov and N. Weiss, Phys. Rev. **D53**, 537(1996).
- [26] L. Stodolsky, Phys. Rev. **D58**, 036006(1998).
- [27] H. J. Lipkin, Phys. Lett. **B642**, 366(2006).
- [28] A. Asahara, K. Ishikawa, T. Shimomura, and T. Yabuki, Prog. Theor. Phys. **113**, 385(2005);
T. Yabuki and K. Ishikawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **108**, 347(2002).
- [29] S. Tomonaga, Prog.Theor.Phys.**1**,(1946)27.
- [30] J. Schwinger,Phys. Rev. **74**,(1948),1439.
- [31] R. Feynman, Phys. Rev. **76**,(1949),749.
- [32] H. Ekstein and A. J. F. Siegert, Ann. Phys. **68**, 509(1971).
- [33] K. J. F. Gaemers and T. D. Visser, Physica. **A 153**, 234(1988).
- [34] K. Nakamura *et al.* [Particle Data Group], J. Phys. G **37**, 075021 (2010).
- [35] E. Komatsu, et al. Astrophys. J. Suppl. **180**, 330–376 (2009).
- [36] K. Ishikawa and Y. Tobita, Prog. Theor. Phys. **122**, (2009), 1111-1136.
- [37] K. Ishikawa and Y. Tobita, arXiv:0801.3124; “Neutrino mass and mixing” in the 10th Inter.
Symp. on “Origin of Matter and Evolution of Galaxies” AIP Conf. proc. 1016, P.329(2008)
- [38] These probabilities from the Fermi’s golden rule do not have contributions from the light-cone
singularity due to the kinetic-energy conservation. A. H. Mueller, Phys. Rev. **D2**, 2963(1970)
- [39] M. Gell-Mann and M. L. Goldberger, Phys. Rev. **96**, 1433(1954).
- [40] O.F. Kulikov, et. al, Phys Lett.**13**, 344(1964).
- [41] K. Ishikawa, and Y. Tobita,preprint ”Coronal heating”.
- [42] K. Ishikawa, T. Sloan, and Y. Tobita, preprint “SN1987A neutrino”.
- [43] R. C. Tolman, *The principles of Statistical Mechanics* (Dove Books on Physics; Dover Pub-
lications, 2010).
- [44] K. Wilson, in Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium on Electron and Photon
Interactions at High Energies, Ithaca, New York, 1971, p.115 (1971). See also N. N. Bogoliubov
and D. V. Shirkov, *Introduction to the Theory of Quantized Fields* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
New York, 1976).

Appendix A: Principle of quantum mechanics

The correction terms derived from the QCS have deep connections with the principle of the quantum mechanics.

1. von Neumann's fundamental principle of the probability

One of the fundamental principles of quantum mechanics is that the transition probability between states $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\beta\rangle$ is given by

$$P = |\langle\beta|\alpha\rangle|^2, \quad (\text{A1})$$

for the normalized states. This was verified in transitions of one-body systems, which is described by a Schrödinger equation, and of many-body systems of identical particles, which are described by quantized fields. The potential scattering of an electron and the elastic scattering of light belong to the former and the particle decays, the radiative transitions of molecules, and others, and their scatterings belong to the latter. In the potential scatterings, the probability density $\rho(t, \vec{x})$ and the current density $\vec{j}(t, \vec{x})$ satisfy the continuity equation $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\rho(t, \vec{x}) + \nabla \cdot \vec{j}(t, \vec{x}) = 0$ regardless of the potential. Based on this, the decay rate and the scattering cross section are defined in a similar manner as the classical mechanics. In systems of identical particles described by quantized fields, however, the fields are operators in a many-body space, and their product do not satisfy the above continuity equation in the presence of many-body interactions. The number of each particle varies, but the total probability is conserved. The transition probability is given by Eq.(A1). In the transition processes measured in the experiments, the initial and final states cover finite sizes determined by the apparatus, and are normalized. In the transitions in nature, the measurements are not made, but those of the initial and the final states have finite range in space. The processes follow the probability obtained by the quantum mechanics. This assertion includes the case $|\alpha\rangle = U|\alpha'\rangle$, $U^\dagger U = 1$, and the transition probability is computed rigorously with the formula Eq.(A1).

Now, for the non-normalized states, the right-hand side of Eq.(A1) diverges and is unable to give the unique probability. Nevertheless, the plane waves are eigenstates of the energy momentum of the free system, and are most convenient for practical calculations. In a case that all the final states satisfy $O_{qcs} = 0$, of Eq.(39), the interaction vanishes. Modified

formula using the plane waves and the adiabatic switching off of the interaction is applicable. The deficit of the non-normalized wave functions is avoided by employing the boundary condition of the adiabatic switching off, by which the effective interaction region is enforced to a finite region, and the ratio of the fluxes, which is useful in particles, the probability proportional to the time interval is uniquely computed with the Fermi's golden rule. This has been verified in most places in the leading order terms in the time interval. Because this boundary condition is artificially set by hand, it is not clear if that agrees exactly with the total probability obtained by Eq.(A1). In the wave-zone, some states satisfy $O_{qcs} \neq 0$, and the interaction of the waves remains and the probability becomes different from that of particles. They reveal wave-like behaviors which are neither calculated with particle dynamics, nor evaluated by the adiabatic switching off. The FQM has been verified for the normalized states, and gives the rigorous probability even in these cases of the wave-zone. The formulation by LSZ [9] use the wave packets, and is suitable to compute the rigorous probability. Unfortunately, LSZ applied the approximations of the wave packets by plane waves in the explicit calculations. This is valid for those that are proportional to the time interval, i.e., the decay rate and the cross section, since the typical scale is the de Broglie wave length which is much shorter than the scale of the physical system. However, the scale of the correction term $P^{(d)}$ is not the de Broglie length but the new scale $\frac{E\hbar}{m^2c^3}$. In the situations that this is much longer than the de Broglie length, $P^{(d)}$ appears, and is not ignorable. The present series of works study this situation and compute the probability based on FQM without approximating the normalized waves with the plane waves. The value from FQM is rigorous, and if the value obtained by the plane wave approximations disagree with those obtained by FQM, that is caused by the approximation.

2. Decoherence of the waves

Another principle of the quantum mechanics is that the physical state is expressed by the wave function. This has been proved in many situations. A duration that the state is described by one wave function, which is solved by the Schrödinger equation also, is not very clear experimentally. For an isolate system, this is expressed by the time dependent wave function that satisfies the Schrödinger equation, and keeps the coherence.

For a state in an environment, the wave function varies according to an interaction with

an environment. The duration is computed by the mean free time of the state. The total Hamiltonian,

$$H = H + H_{ev}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where H is the physical system of interest and H_{ev} shows their interaction with the environment. The state vector depends on the variables of the physical system and other parameters,

$$|x_i; \beta_1, \beta_2, \dots\rangle. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Unless necessary, the space of the states of the environment are ignored.

If the phase of the scattered wave varies with the dynamical variables that specify the states steeply, the coherent nature of these waves are washed out easily, when they make a reaction with others. Decoherent wave behaves like a particle or ensemble of particles, and are expressed approximately by classical objects.

Appendix B: Gibbs ensemble, Boltzmann equation, and Ergodic hypothesis

Particles are small in sizes and the interaction switches off rapidly in the microscopic scale of the order of de Broglie wave length in collisions. They preserve the kinetic energy and momentum, and the transition probabilities are determined by the dynamics in the microscopic scale. They follow Markov nature. This collision term leads the Boltzmann equation consistent with the Gibbs ensemble. The states in the space of the wave functions $\Psi_p(t)$ reveal the particle properties of conserving the kinetic-energy, and the probabilities Eqs.(52), (53) of this behavior. After the many independent transitions, the distribution follows the principle of equal a priori probability and the Boltzmann distribution,

$$P_G = e^{-\beta H}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

using an average energy per each freedom $\frac{1}{\beta} = kT$. The states follow the normal thermodynamics expressed by the Gibbs ensemble [43]. Many phenomena in fact follow this distribution.

Now the space expressed by $\Psi_w(t)$ reveals the overlap of the waves that is expressed by the wave function in macroscopic short time-interval, and remains the same long period. That does neither satisfy the conservation law of the kinetic energy, nor the Markov nature.

In the decays, they follow the time-independent power law Eq.(57) instead of the exponential behavior. The probability $P^{(d)}$ determines the initial probability for the Boltzmann equation that is proportional to a power of the visible energy, i.e., the kinetic energy. Accordingly, this distribution is determined by the wave functions and follows the power law in the kinetic energy, and is independent of the temperature. This behavior is observed in many area. They should show the characteristics of the interacting waves in non-equilibrium situations. It would be important to note that the total statistical ensemble of these waves are the product of this term and that of Gibbs ensemble

$$P = P_G \times P_D, \quad (\text{B2})$$

where P_D is the distribution corresponding to $P^{(d)}$.

In a hypothetical case of the interaction Eq.(C3), the space is composed of Ψ_w , and Ψ_p is not included, and $P = P^{(d)}$. The distribution is determined by that of the quantum mechanics.

The probability in the scattering or the decay in the particle-zone covers the wide angle in each reaction. Accordingly the whole phase space is covered ultimately, and leads us to the Ergodic hypothesis. Those in the wave-zone, however, is restricted to the extreme forward angle in the time-independent manner, and does not cover the whole phase space. Hence this component does not follow the Ergodic hypothesis.

Appendix C: Interaction Lagrangian of the total derivative

An example of showing $\Gamma = 0$, $P^{(d)} \neq 0$ was given in [3], and the other is a system of a scalar field $\varphi(x)$ and a vector field $\varphi_\mu(x)$ described by an action

$$S = \int d^4x (L_0 + L_{int}), \quad (\text{C1})$$

$$L_0 = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \varphi(x) \partial^\mu \varphi(x) - \frac{1}{2} m_1^2 \varphi(x)^2 + \frac{1}{4} f_{\mu\nu} f^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} m_2^2 \varphi_\mu(x) \varphi^\mu(x), \quad (\text{C2})$$

$$f_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \varphi_\nu(x) - \partial_\nu \varphi_\mu(x),$$

where $m_2 > 2m_1$ and L_{int} is

$$L_{int} = -g \partial_\mu (\varphi^\mu(x) \varphi(x)^2). \quad (\text{C3})$$

This is a total derivative and the action integral becomes a surface term

$$S_{int} = -g \int d^3 S_\mu (\varphi^\mu(x) \varphi(x)^2). \quad (C4)$$

The interaction does not modify the equation of motion in the bulk, but affects the wave function and the transition probability [3].

In the standard method of the covariant perturbation theory, the Tomonaga-Feynman-Schwinger formalism [29–31], the plane waves and the adiabatic switching off of the interaction are used. The vertex part of the interaction Eq.(C3) in the momentum representation becomes

$$-g \int d^4 x \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\mu} e^{i(p_1 - p_2 - p'_2) \cdot x} = -ig(2\pi)^4 (p_1 - p_2 - p_3)_\mu \delta^4(p_1 - p_2 - p'_2). \quad (C5)$$

The right-hand side vanishes in the normal treatment of the Dirac's delta function, and so does the transition amplitude. Accordingly the probability proportional to the time-interval computed with the Fermi's golden rule vanishes. This method does not supply the constant term, $P^{(d)}$. This is computed rigorously from the FQM for the normalized state, which does not vanish and is finite. Thus this vector $\varphi^\mu(x)$ has the decay rate $\Gamma = 0$ and the infinite mean life-time $\tau = \infty$, but due to $P^{(d)} \neq 0$, the norm varies as in Eq.(30). This is a counter example that the method of the adiabatic switching off of the interaction is applicable to QCS and $P^{(d)}$.

Appendix D: Light-cone singularities of transition probabilities

The light-cone singularity plays an important role [44] for the $P^{(d)}$ in the many body transitions of extended relativistic waves. Those in the scatterings are summarized.

1. Two body scattering

Scalar particle

Scalar particles A,B,C, and D of the momentum $\vec{p}_A$, $\vec{p}_B$, $\vec{p}_C$, and $\vec{p}_D$, where C is detected at the position $\vec{X}_C, T_C$ are studied. A, B, C, D can be 1, 2 of Section 2, or i, j, k of Section 3. The amplitude

$$A(\vec{p}_A) + B(\vec{p}_C) \rightarrow C(\vec{p}_C, \vec{X}_C, T_C) + D(\vec{p}_D) \quad (D1)$$

in the lowest order of the interaction $H_{int} = J(x)\varphi_c(x)$ is written as

$$\mathcal{M} = \int dx \omega(x, \vec{p}_C, \vec{X}_C, T_C) \langle D, \vec{p}_D | J(x) | A, \vec{p}_A; B, \vec{p}_B, \rangle, \quad (D2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D, \vec{p}_D | J(x) | A, \vec{p}_A; B, \vec{p}_B \rangle &= e^{-i(p_A + p_B - p_D) \cdot x} G((p_A - p_D)^2, (p_B - p_D)^2), \\ G((p_A - p_D)^2, (p_B - p_D)^2) &= \langle D, \vec{p}_D | J(0) | A, \vec{p}_A; B, \vec{p}_B \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (D3)$$

[38] We have the expression

$$|\mathcal{M}|^2 = \int dx_1 dx_2 \omega(x_1, \vec{p}_C, \vec{X}_C, T_C)^* \omega(x_2, \vec{p}_C, \vec{X}_C, T_C) \Delta_{A,B,C}(x_1 - x_2), \quad (D4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{A,B,C}(x_1 - x_2) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d\vec{p}_D}{2E(\vec{p}_D)} e^{-i(p_A + p_B - p_D) \cdot (x_1 - x_2)} |G(p_A - p_D)^2, (p_B - p_D)^2|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (D5)$$

We change the variable to the new variable $q = p_A + p_B - p_D$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{A,B,C}(x_1 - x_2) &= \frac{1}{i(2\pi)^4} \int dq \times e^{-iq \cdot (x_1 - x_2)} |G(q - p_B)^2, (q - p_A)^2|^2 \\ &\times \left(\frac{1}{q^2 + m_{A,B}^2 - m_D^2 + 2q(p_A + p_B) - i\epsilon} - \frac{1}{q^2 + m_{A,B}^2 - m_D^2 + 2q(p_A + p_B) + i\epsilon} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{i(2\pi)^4} \int dq e^{-iq \cdot (x_1 - x_2)} |G(q^2 + m_B^2 - 2qp_B, q^2 + m_A - 2 - 2qp_A)|^2 \\ &\left(\frac{1}{q^2 + m_{A,B}^2 - m_D^2 + 2q(p_A + p_B) - i\epsilon} - \frac{1}{q^2 + m_{A,B}^2 - m_D^2 + 2q(p_A + p_B) + i\epsilon} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (D6)$$

where

$$m_{A,B}^2 = (p_A + p_B)^2, \quad (D7)$$

Expanding the denominator,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{q^2 + m_{A,B}^2 - m_D^2 + 2q(p_A + p_B) - \pm i\epsilon} \\ &= D_1 \frac{1}{q^2 + m_{A,B}^2 - m_D^2 - \pm i\epsilon}, \\ D_1(q) &= \sum_p \frac{1}{p!} (2q(p_A + p_B))^p \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial m_D^2} \right)^p, \end{aligned} \quad (D8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &|G(q^2 + m_B^2 - 2qp_B, q^2 + m_A - 2 - 2qp_A)|^2 \\ &= D_2 |G(q^2 + m_B^2, q^2 + m_A)|^2, \\ D_2(q) &= \sum_{p,q} \frac{1}{p!q!} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial m_B^2} \right)^p (-2qp_B)^p \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial m_A^2} \right)^q (-2qp_A)^q, \end{aligned} \quad (D9)$$

are substituted to $\Delta_{A,B,C}(x_1 - x_2)$. We have then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Delta_{A,B,C}(x_1 - x_2) \tag{D10} \\
&= D_1(i\frac{\partial}{\partial\delta x})D_2(i\frac{\partial}{\partial\delta x})\frac{1}{i(2\pi)^4}\int dqe^{-iq\cdot(x_1-x_2)}|G(q^2+m_B^2,q^2+m_A^2)|^2 \\
&\quad \times (\frac{1}{q^2+m_{A,B}^2-m_D^2-i\epsilon}-\frac{1}{q^2+m_{A,B}^2-m_D^2+i\epsilon}) \\
&= D_1(i\frac{\partial}{\partial\delta x})D_2(i\frac{\partial}{\partial\delta x})iD^+(\delta x,m_D^2-m_{A,B}^2)|G(m_D^2-m_{A,B}^2+m_B^2,m_D^2-m_{A,B}^2+m_A^2)|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The light-cone singularity of $\Delta_{A,B,C}(x_1 - x_2)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Delta_{A,B,C}(x_1 - x_2)_{light-cone} \tag{D11} \\
&= D_2(i\frac{\partial}{\partial\delta x})|G(m_D^2-m_{A,B}^2+m_B^2,m_D^2-m_{A,B}^2+m_A^2)|^2i(\frac{1}{4\pi})\delta(\lambda)\epsilon(\delta t) \\
&= |G(m_D^2-m_{A,B}^2+m_B^2-2i\frac{\partial}{\partial\delta x}p_B,m_D^2-m_{A,B}^2+m_A^2-2i\frac{\partial}{\partial\delta x}p_A)|^2i(\frac{1}{4\pi})\delta(\lambda)\epsilon(\delta t).
\end{aligned}$$

From the light-cone singularity, we have the probability,

$$|\mathcal{M}|^2 = \int dx_1 dx_2 \omega(x_1, \vec{p}_C, \vec{X}_C, T_C)^* \omega(x_2, \vec{p}_C, \vec{X}_C, T_C) \tag{D12}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \times |G(m_D^2-m_{A,B}^2+m_B^2-2i\frac{\partial}{\partial\delta x}p_B,m_D^2-m_{A,B}^2+m_A^2-2i\frac{\partial}{\partial\delta x}p_A)|^2 \\
& \times i(\frac{1}{4\pi})\delta(\lambda)\epsilon(\delta t) \\
&= \int dx_1 dx_2 \omega(x_1, \vec{p}_C, \vec{X}_C, T_C)^* \omega(x_2, \vec{p}_C, \vec{X}_C, T_C) \tag{D13} \\
& \times |G(m_D^2-m_{A,B}^2+m_B^2-2p_B p_C, m_D^2-m_{A,B}^2+m_A^2-2p_A p_C)|^2 \\
& \times i(\frac{1}{4\pi})\delta(\lambda)\epsilon(\delta t) \\
&= |G(m_D^2-m_{A,B}^2+m_B^2-2p_B p_C, m_D^2-m_{A,B}^2+m_A^2-2p_A p_C)|^2 \\
& \times (\sigma_C \pi)^{3/2} \frac{\sigma_C}{2} T(\tilde{g}(\omega_C T) - \pi),
\end{aligned}$$

where the integral

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int dx_1 dx_2 e^{i\phi_C(\delta x)} e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_C} \sum_i (\vec{x}_1 - \vec{X}_B - \vec{v}_C(t_1 - T_C))^2} \frac{i}{4\pi} \delta(\lambda) \epsilon(\delta t) \tag{D14} \\
&= (\sigma_C \pi)^{3/2} \frac{\sigma_C}{2} T(\tilde{g}(\omega_C T) - \pi) \\
& \omega_C = E(\vec{p}_C) - \vec{v}_C \vec{p}_C
\end{aligned}$$

was substituted. The finite-size correction to the probability is

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{M}|^2 &= |G(m_D^2-m_{A,B}^2+m_B^2-2p_B p_C, m_D^2-m_{A,B}^2+m_A^2-2p_A p_C)|^2 \\
& \times (\sigma_C \pi)^{3/2} \frac{\sigma_C}{2} T(\tilde{g}(\omega_C T)).
\end{aligned}$$

The light-cone singularity exists in the kinematic region

$$2p_C(p_A + p_B) \leq m_{A,B}^2 - m_D^2, \quad (\text{D15})$$

from the conditions for the convergence. So $\vec{p}_C$ is integrated in this region.

2. Universal function $\tilde{g}(\omega, T)$

For the case that the mass of C is tiny, the approximation $e^{-\frac{(\vec{v}_C - \vec{v}_{C'})^2}{4\sigma_C}\delta t^2} = e^{-\frac{(1-|\vec{v}_{C'}|)^2\delta t^2}{4\sigma_C}} = 1$ is good, which cannot be used for massive particles, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(\omega_C, T) &= i \int_0^T dt_1 dt_2 \frac{e^{i\omega_C(t_1 - t_2)}}{t_1 - t_2} \\ &= -2 \int_0^T dt \frac{\sin(\omega_C t)}{t}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D16})$$

where $t_+ = \frac{t_1 + t_2}{2}$, $t_- = t_1 - t_2$. Since $g(\omega_C, \infty) = -\pi$ is cancelled with the short-range term from J_{regular} , we write

$$\tilde{g}(\omega_C, T) = 2\left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \int_0^T dt \frac{\sin(\omega_C t)}{t}\right), \quad (\text{D17})$$

which satisfies

$$\tilde{g}(\omega_C, T) = \pi; \quad \omega_C T \ll 1, \quad (\text{D18})$$

$$|\tilde{g}(\omega_C, T)| \sim \frac{2}{\omega_C T}; \quad \omega_C T \gg 1. \quad (\text{D19})$$

Appendix E: Long distance propagation of QCS wave packet

The velocity of the central position of a wave packet is $\vec{v} = \frac{\vec{p}}{E(\vec{p})}$, and that of two wave packets of $\vec{v}_1, \sigma_1$ and $\vec{v}_2, \sigma_2$ is $\vec{v} = \frac{\sigma_1 \vec{v}_2 + \sigma_2 \vec{v}_1}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2}$. QCS of the momentum $\vec{P}$, the position $\vec{X}$, and time T satisfies the wave equation

$$[i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial T} - i\hbar v_i \frac{\partial}{\partial X_i}] |\vec{P}, \vec{X}, T\rangle = 0, \quad (\text{E1})$$

using the central values. The velocity of the central position for the overlapping wave packets is for $\sigma_1 \gg \sigma_2$, $\vec{v} \approx \vec{v}_2$, and for $\sigma_2 \gg \sigma_1$, $\vec{v} = \vec{v}_1$. The electron's velocity is lower than the speed of light, hence a composite state of the photon and the electron wave moves with a

speed slower than the speed of the light unless $\sigma_e \gg \sigma_\gamma$. Accordingly the photon signal delays by an amount

$$\Delta T = (1/v - 1/c)L, \quad (\text{E2})$$

if the $P^{(d)}$ of the photon electron interaction is large.

Next we study the equation of motion of QCS modified by an interaction in the forward direction, in which the initial wave packet loses a fractional energy. Let us write the interaction energy in the form $V(X)$, then the wave equation is

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial T} |\vec{P}, \vec{X}, T\rangle = (i\hbar v_i \frac{\partial}{\partial X_i} + V(\vec{X})) |\vec{P}, \vec{X}, T\rangle. \quad (\text{E3})$$

In the vacuum $V(X) = 0$, and in a system of many electrons, $V(X)$ is determined by them. In the present case, the photon's energy is distributed continuously with the probability $P(E)$ and is represented with $V(x) > 0$, and the wave equation is a superposition

$$|\vec{P}, \vec{X}, T\rangle = \int dE P(E) e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}(ET - \int^X dx' (E - V_E(x')))} |\vec{P}, \vec{X}, 0\rangle, \quad (\text{E4})$$

which is a wave packet constructed from the original wave packets. We write

$$\delta(E) = \int dx' V_E(x'). \quad (\text{E5})$$

For a $P(E) = N e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_E}(E-E_0)^2}$,

$$|\vec{P}, \vec{X}, T\rangle = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}(E_0 T - E_0 X + \delta(E_0))} e^{-\frac{\sigma_E}{2} \frac{1}{\hbar^2}(T - X + \delta'(E_0))^2}. \quad (\text{E6})$$

Thus the signal delays by an amount, $\delta'(E_0)$.